THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, ETHNICITY, AND SEX OF THE STUDENT; THE SIZE, LOCATION, AND ETHNICITY OF THE SCHOOL, IN SELECTED TRI-ETHNIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

By

ARMANDO R. GARRIDO

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1978

To my parents

Armando and Blanca Garrido

with filial devotion

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to Dr. S. Kern Alexander for assuming the chairmanship of his doctoral committee in the absence of Dr. Hines. Dr. Alexander's scholarly criticism and assistance aided in the completion of this project.

A sincere note of gratitude goes to Dr. Ralph B. Kimbrough for his support, guidance, and assistance in this research effort.

To Dr. Hal G. Lewis, for his willingness to be on the committee during Dr. Hines' absence, the writer offers a special note of thanks.

The writer wishes also to express his overwhelming debt to Dr. Vynce A. Hines for his encouragement, continued help, and personal support. He provided inspiration without which this research would never have been completed.

To my children, Tellita, Armando, and Jacinto, who did without a father for over two years, I extend a special note of gratitude.

Last, but not least, the writer acknowledges his concern for all the underprivileged children in whose interest this work was undertaken and to whom he dedicates

whatever knowledge and enhancement of the educational climate this project may bring forth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, ETHNICITY, AND SEX OF THE STUDENT; THE SIZE, LOCATION, AND ETHNICITY OF THE SCHOOL, IN SELECTED TRI-ETHNIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

By

Armando R. Garrido

August, 1978

Chairman: Dr. S. Kern Alexander
Cochairman: Dr. Vynce A. Hines
Major Department: Educational Administration

The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there existed significant relationships between disruptive behavior and the socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of the student; and the location and size of the school. A secondary purpose was to determine whether there was a relationship between the ethnicity of the school principal and the kinds of students who exhibited disruptive behavior.

The sample consisted of 1,080 students drawn from 12 junior high schools in Dade County with a total population of 14,281 students. Half of the junior high schools were located in urban Dade County, and the other half were located in suburban Dade County. Two of the junior high schools were of small size, 7 were of medium size, and 3 were of large size. Fifty percent (50%) of the principals were white American, and the other 50% were non-white American. Ninety students were selected from each school,

comprised of equal number of males and females from each of the 3 ethnic groups.

During the spring of 1978, questionnaires were used to obtain measures of socio-economic status, ethnicity, sex, and disruptive behavior of the students in the sample. Measures of the schools' characteristics--size, location, and the ethnic origin of the principal--were also obtained. Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was used in order to determine the socio-economic status of each student in the sample. The questionnaires were completed by the students under the supervision of a guidance counselor. The assistant principal in charge of discipline for each school reviewed them to ascertain that the information about the students' school behavior was accurate. Of the 1,080 students selected, 123 were identified as disruptive.

Two statistical techniques were used to analyze the data in this study. Multiple regression was used in testing the first hypothesis, and chi square was used in testing the rest.

Ten conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the data in this study:

1. The proportion of disruptive lower socio-economic status students was significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive middle- and upper-class students. Furthermore, this variable had the highest relationship with the incidence of disruptive behavior.

2. The proportion of disruptive male students was significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive female students.

3. The ethnicity of the student was incidental to the incidence of disruptive behavior when socio-economic status was taken into consideration.

4. The proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic-status male students is significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive middle- and upper-socio-economic-status male students.

5. The proportions of disruptive black American and Hispanic-origin male students are significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive black American and Hispanic-origin female students.

6. The proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic-status students in schools with white American principals was significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic-status students in schools with non-white American principals.

7. The proportion of disruptive black American students in schools with white American principals was significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive black American students in schools with non-white American principals.

8. There was no significant difference in the proportions of disruptive students of different ethnic origins in schools with non-white American principals.

9. Schools with white American principals identified as disruptive a significantly higher proportion of black American students and a significantly lower proportion of white American students than schools with non-white American principals.

10. The proportion of disruptive students in the eighth grade was significantly lower than the proportions of disruptive students in the seventh and ninth grade.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Disruptive behavior has always been an area of great concern for educators, not only because society expects that schools, as one of its institutions, will play a major role in the socialization process of its youth, but also because, for the learning process to take place, it is necessary that the classroom environment be conducive to education. The educational purposes of the school are accomplished best in a climate where the duties and responsibilities of the students and the rules and regulations of the school are respected.

About a decade ago a major transformation in the modes of behavior of our youth began to take place, to the dismay of governmental authorities, parents, and educators, significantly increasing the generation gap. The emphasis on guaranteeing the constitutional rights of students and minorities, the drastic changes brought about by recent Supreme Court decisions upon the procedures for controlling students' behavior, the Viet Nam War and the anti-war demonstrations, the assassination of political and civic leaders of the sixties, violence on television, the increase in the divorce rate and in the

number of homes where both parents work, and the rapid evolution of our youth culture have all been factors which have produced a shattering impact upon student behavior. In fact, although disruptive behavior is not new to American schools, it has become more frequent and has involved a greater number of students.

In Florida, the problem of disruptive behavior in the schools has affected every school district and has resulted in fiscal and human capital losses to the state. Because of this, in 1973, The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth was created to conduct studies throughout the state.

During the junior high grades, students experience a drastic change in the rate of physical growth and for them reaching puberty has great physiological and psychological implications. This period of time in a student's life is considered the most difficult one in all grades, K through 12 inclusive. Because of these changes, it is in the junior high school where students manifest the most behavioral problems.

Many hypotheses have been formulated on the subject of disruptive youth in schools. Several of them shall be examined in an attempt to arrive at some qualified, enlightened answers. Hopefully, if factors that cause disruptive behavior can be identified, then measures may be taken to prevent its occurrence. It is

usually easier and preferable to take preventive measures to solve a conflict of this nature than it is to try to arrest the problem once it has erupted openly. Disruptive behavior not only interrupts the learning process within the classroom, but in the more serious cases may result in the forceful removal of the student from the classroom. It follows that his removal from the academic environment necessarily has deleterious effects upon his learning process. The more times the suspension occurs, the less probable that the student eventually will catch up with his/her school work. Expulsion is a more serious matter because it denies the youth the opportunity of rehabilitation, at least within his/her own environment.

Nature of the Study

This study was an associational study of various student characteristics, some junior high school characteristics, and student suspensions during the first eight months of the 1977-78 school year. Twelve of the forty-six junior high schools in Dade County participated in the study. Each of the schools had a representative population of white Americans, black Americans, and Hispanic origin students. Three variables of the students--ethnicity, socio-economic status, and sex, together with three variables of the school--size, location, and ethnicity of the principal, were analyzed with the frequency of student

suspensions and statisfically tested. Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was used to determine the socio-economic status of the students.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to attempt to ascertain whether socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of the student, and the location and size of the school can be predictors of disruptive behavior in tri-ethnic junior high schools, of white American, black American, and Hispanic-origin students.

A secondary purpose was to discover whether there is a relationship between the ethnicity of the school principal and the kinds of students who exhibit disruptive behavior. More specifically, this research sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the number of disruptive students of lower, middle, and high socio-economic positions in junior high schools?

2. What is the difference in the number of disruptive students of white American, black American, and Hispanic-origin students in junior high schools?

3. Is there any difference in the incidence of disruptive behavior between male and female students in junior high schools?

4. Is there a difference in the number of disruptive students in urban and suburban junior high schools?

5. Is there any difference in the incidence of disruptive behavior in small, medium, and large size junior high schools?

6. Does the ethnic origin of the school principal have any effect upon the kind of students who exhibit disruptive behavior in junior high schools?

Limitations of the Study

Three limitations were recognized in this study:

1. The results of this study have validity only concerning disruptive behavior in tri-ethnic junior high schools in Dade County, Florida.

2. The information contained in the questionnaires was accepted as accurate.

3. No consideration has been given to whether teacher effectiveness is related to disruptive acts occurring in the classroom.

Definition of Terms

A disruptive student was operationally defined as any junior high school student who is removed from

the school environment for behavior reasons during the first eight months of the 1977-78 school year.

A junior high school student was operationally defined as any student in the seventh, eighth, or ninth grades of a junior high school.

A Hispanic-origin student was operationally defined as any student born in a Hispanic country or of Hispanic descent.

An urban junior high school was operationally defined as any junior high school in Dade County within a six-mile radius from downtown Miami.

A small size junior high school was operationally defined as one with a school population of less than 1000 students.

A medium size junior high school was operationally defined as one with a school population of between 1000 and 1499 students.

A large size junior high school was operationally defined as one with a school population of 1500 or more students.

Sampling

A stratified random sample of equal numbers of male and female students from each ethnic group (white American, black American, and Hispanic-origin) was drawn from a computer printout by ethnic origin of the

student population of each of the twelve junior high schools selected. The sample of each of the twelve junior high schools selected in this study contained:

15 male white American students

15 female white American students

15 male black American students

15 female black American students

15 male Hispanic-origin students

15 female Hispanic-origin students

Data Collection

A questionnaire was used to gather the data needed for this study (see Appendix). It had the student's name at the top. This questionnaire indicated that the student's name should be detached from the form before it was returned, because of a requirement of the Dade County Schools Research Committee designed to maintain the privacy rights of the students involved in studies. The questionnaire provided the following information.

1. grade
2. sex
3. ethnicity
4. occupation of the student's father
5. occupation of the student's mother
6. level of schooling completed by the student's father.

7. level of schooling completed by the student's mother
8. whether the student had been suspended
9. ethnicity of the school principal
10. name of the school.

Significance

In the ninth annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools, discipline (disruptive behavior) was singled out as the major problem confronting the public schools of the nation.

This study increased the existing body of knowledge about the relationship of socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of students, the ethnicity of the principal, the size and location of the junior high school, and disruptive student behavior. There had been some research done on disruptive behavior previously, but little or none had been done in a tri-ethnic setting. The findings of this study have practical significance for educators who practice their profession in urban and suburban, multi-ethnic settings and in particular for those educators working in Dade County, Florida. The results of this study will be made available for sharing with any and all interested educators.

Organization of the Study

This introductory chapter has included the statement of the problem, the nature, limitations, and significance of the study, as well as the method of sampling and data collection. Chapter II will include the review of the literature. The design of the study will be discussed in Chapter III. Chapter IV will present the results of the study, and the summary, discussion, and conclusions will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The major concern of this study is the relationship between disruptive behavior and socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of the students; and the location, size, and ethnicity of the principal of the school.

A review of the literature found no study incorporating these variables, but it yielded many studies about disruptive behavior some of which incorporate one or more of the variables.

The literature on disruptive behavior has been varied. Studies have been conducted in such areas as prevention and identification (Gloeckler et al., 1968; Mussman, 1968; Hegstrom and Hugh, 1969; Nelson, 1971), behavior modification techniques (Edwards 1968; Casstevens, 1969; Wodarski, 1970; Burrows, 1971; Starky, 1973), perceptions (Mendell, 1968; Driscoll, 1970), activism (Erickson et al., 1965; Trump and Hunt, 1969), school discipline (Kounin, 1970), mental retardation (Szurek and Berlin, 1968), social class (Warner, 1949; Hollingshead, 1949; Davis, 1953; Conant, 1961), ethnicity and ethnic composition (Blake, 1960; Smith, 1962; Gurin, 1966; West, 1966), emotional disorders (Hewett et al., 1967; Braun and Lasher,

1970), juvenile delinquency (Block and Flynn, 1956; Reckless and Dinitz, 1972), delinquency and self-concept (Balester, 1956; Atchinson, 1958; Scarpitti, Murray, Dinitz, and Reckless, 1960; Lively, Dinitz, and Reckless, 1962; Lefeber, 1965; Fitts and Hamner, 1969), and autistic children (Bosch, 1970).

Literature on Disruption

The Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools (1977) reported the highest percentage yet recorded of parents of public school students citing discipline as the number one problem in the schools, with integration/segregation/ busing being in second place, and lack of proper financial support in third.

A study of the experience of teachers with disruptive behavior in the Dade Public Schools (1976) reported that the junior high school teachers spend a considerably greater proportion of their time in dealing with disruptive behavior than elementary and senior high school teachers, with 12.2 percent being struck by students, 39.6 percent being threatened by a student with physical harm, and 72.7 percent having their instructional process completely disrupted.

Duke (1978) reported that administrators of urban and non-urban high schools in California and New York

identified truancy, skipping, and lateness to class as the three most pressing discipline problems. He also indicated that most administrators found themselves not enforcing school rules consistently.

In contrast, King-Stoops and Meir (1978) listed fighting, lack of respect for selves, other students, and teachers, and destruction of school materials and profanity among the 10 more important discipline problems identified by teachers.

Student teachers, in a study conducted by Driscoll (1970) identified failure to follow directions, making noise in the halls, whispering, talking in class, and chewing gum among the most frequent types of disruptive behavior. Being under the influence of narcotics, stealing, starting fires, and bomb threats were identified among the most serious offenses.

In a study on early identification of children who are likely to display poor social adjustment, low academic achievement, and/or delinquency, Feldhusen (1971) found that classroom behavior traits, arithmetic achievement, child's parents' marital relationship, and maternal discipline were predictors of late social adjustment. Teacher ratings of social adjustment, I.Q., sex, parents' educational level, and classroom behavior were found to be predictors of academic achievement.

The purpose of a study conducted by Feldhusen, Benning, and Thurston (1964) was to link elements of students' backgrounds with school misbehavior. After analyzing the home environment of students who exhibited disruptive behavior in the classroom, some psycho-social correlates of misbehavior were found:

1. The discipline of the father was either too lax or too strict, and the supervision of the mother was inadequate.

2. The parents were indifferent or hostile toward the student, and the family lacked unity.

3. The parents were not close and found it difficult to discuss the child's problems.

4. The parents disapproved of many things in their child and were not happy with the community where they lived.

5. Both parents believed they could not influence the development of their child and resorted to angry corporal punishment when disciplining their child.

6. The parents' leisure time activities did not help the social development of the child; as a result of this attitude they thought that other children were bad influences upon their child.

In a more recent study, they also discovered that boys prone to delinquency achieved less in mathematics than the non-delinquency-prone boys, and the former were ranked much lower in their graduating class than their counterparts.

Kaga (1972) pointed out that twelve-year-olds are presented by Western society with local phenomena surrounding school, drugs, sexuality, authority, and family, each of which generates uncertainty that the child must resolve. Contemporary fifteen-year-olds are waging a war against feelings of isolation and are rendered anti-social as a paradoxical reaction to these feelings. Racial strife, density of population, and even more important, lack of values and central ideology, continue to loom as potential catastrophies in the future and, of course, often result in disruptive behavior.

S. R. St. J. Neill (1976) used etiological methods previously applied mainly to young children (Blurton-Jones, 1972) with pre-adolescent boys in a playground situation. These methods were well suited to the playground situation because of the ease of observation without disturbance and because of the range of behavior shown and its dominance in such a situation over verbal communication. The older boys presented a greater incidence of violent behavior and fighting, suggesting that age may be a possible variable in the prediction of disruptive patterns of behavior.

Miller (1974) reported that the average juvenile delinquent has an I.Q. of 95 and is two to four years below his potential by the time he has been in the public schools for seven years.

Twelve principals from a midwest city system met briefly with a number of professors and administrators from the College of Education of the Ohio State University, as reported by Cunningham (1969). The Dean of the College of Education, in an objective report of his experience as an inner city junior high school principal, observed the phenomenon of the principal in relationship to disruptive behavior in the school. There had been a faculty walk-out previously due to school conditions. The students were mostly black. Absenteeism prevailed. About one-fifth of the entire student body was absent every day. The only time students showed up was at lunch time in many cases. Lunch was partly federally funded. Students came into the school building in spite of guards, had their lunch, and went out into the street again. Absenteeism among the school's eighty-five teachers was quite prevalent also. Fights broke out quite frequently. One teacher had been shot ten days before the author arrived on the scene. He had been held up on the street, adjacent to the school, and shot with a pellet gun.

Duke (1976) examined the issue of who misbehaves in the article by that title. In considering a wide range of variables, it was found that students were apt to show evidence of dirsuptive behavior if they had instances of failure in elementary school. He also

stated that there is a positive indication that disruptive behavior and intelligence are inversely related, i.e., the more intelligence, the less the likelihood of showing disruptive behavior and vice versa. The final words of the article point out the need for further research to wit: research concerning itself with "real world" types of investigation rather than more esoteric "unreal" types of research. The author also points to the fact that researchers should not be banned from the schools only because of the sensitive nature of the schools's discipline.

Redl (1975) was saddened at the fact that disruptive behavior results in suspension and expulsion which, in turn, create hostility and result in more disruptive behavior. Only when a child and his environment are so badly matched that continuation would present the possibility of life-long scars should the child be removed from his learning environment.

Henning (1949) distributed questionnaires to twenty-five high school principals and asked them about the extent and seriousness of student misconduct. It is significant to note that twenty-eight years ago the most serious offenses were considered to be lying, petty theivery, and getting together in halls and lavatories. These examples of misconduct seem hardly worthy of mention in today's more violent school environment.

We can contrast the above with the findings of Cutts and Moseley (1957) who cited the most common instances of misbehavior as the following: talking, physical attack, unexcused absences, throwing things, and physical activity. They also listed items as diverse as chewing gum and immorality as examples of disruptive behavior.

Studying the different perceptions of disruptive behavior among secondary school teachers, counselors, and deans, Mendell (1968) found that deans chose more severe punishments for disruptive students than did secondary school teachers and counselors. The older the teacher the more severe disciplinary measures recommended. Male educators chose greater penalties than female educators. He also pointed out that educators chose more severe punishment for male students than for female students.

The National Institute of Education (1977) conducted a study to determine the frequency and seriousness of crime in elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

The study was divided into three phases. In Phase I more than 4,000 school principals were asked to report, through a mail survey, the incidence of illegal or disruptive activities in their schools. The participating schools were chosen at random.

In Phase II, field representatives conducted on-site surveys of a representative sample of 642 junior and senior high schools. Principals, teachers, and students were surveyed. They also reported information about themselves, their schools, and their communities.

In Phase III, a more intensive study of ten schools was conducted. These ten schools had been identified as having a history of crime and violence but had shown a dramatic improvement in a short time.

Some of the most important findings of the study were, in summary, the following:

1. In school, risk of violence to teenagers is greater than elsewhere.

2. The larger the community, the greater the proportion of schools having a serious problem.

3. Higher levels of school crime are reported in secondary schools than those in elementary schools.

4. The proportion of teachers attacked is smaller in rural areas and in senior high schools than in large cities and in junior high schools.

5. In secondary schools, personal violence and vandalism are much more prevalent than in elementary schools; on the other hand, in senior highs and junior highs the incidence of property offenses is about the same, although personal violence is most pronounced in junior highs.

6. The classrooms are the safest places for students in school with high risks during the between-class rushes in hallways and on stairs.

7. Taking all factors into consideration, there is no apparent relationship between a school's racial/ethnic composition and the risk of violence there.

8. More violence and vandalism are experienced in larger schools and schools with larger classes.

9. Students' feelings of frustration can erupt in violence if students do not feel that their courses are relevant and that they have some control over school events.

10. The most likely violent students are those who give up on school.

11. A key factor in reducing violence seems to be a consistent system for running a school were known rules are firmly and fairly enforced.

12. A central conclusion is that the principal's role appears to be a critical factor in that the principal's leadership and initiation of a structure of order seem to differentiate safe schools from unsafe ones.

13. As found, the principal's ability to initiate a structure of order in the school is equally important to his/her personal style of leadership, especially with fair, firm, and most of all, consistent action on his/her part.

A perusal of Dissertation Abstracts yielded some studies on disruptive behavior. Burrows (1971) investigated the effects of systematic changes in the levels of teacher approval on students' disruptive behavior and self-concepts. In one classroom the teacher eliminated approval for three weeks. In another classroom the teacher increased the approval level for six weeks. In classroom No. 1 a functional relationship between levels of teacher approval and student disruptive behavior was demonstrated. In classroom No. 2 a decrease in teacher approval resulted in no significant changes in disruptive behavior nor self-concept. No associations were found between self-concept changes and achievement, intelligence, socio-economic status, or sex.

Hendrix (1970) stressed the need for able and dedicated teachers who know the ghetto and its problems and understand the psychological and social deficits of these students. Studying the causes of why inner city children do not achieve as well as others, he found, "Discrimination and racism, family disorganization, poor self-image, white colonial middle-class schools in Black ghettos, and inadequate teachers are documented as some of the most significant causes of this failure" (p. 283).

According to his findings, some of the most important needs of inner city students are: "(a) positive self-image, (b) expanded aspirational level, (c) success

experiences, (d) peer group encouragement of academic success, (e) exposure to black culture, and (f) an understanding of the general culture" (p. 283).

In a study of how students' misbehavior was perceived by teachers in the Michigan Public Schools, Teitelbaum (1970) found that the teachers perceived the most serious and most frequent disruptive behavior involved students' relationships to other students, followed by violations of school authority.

In a study designed to clarify the conditions that determine teachers' behavior in their reaction to child misbehavior, Victor (1970) reported that while his study yielded no statistically significant findings, there were a number of significant trends. Individuals who scored higher in teacher direct attitudes participated more in misbehavior. Furthermore, this difference was the result of non-verbal behavior. The high conceptual level teacher direct group gave more positive sanctions than any other group and no differences were found between personality and attitude, and the adaptability index.

Wodarski (1970), in a study to determine to what extent behavior modification techniques, based on Skinner's operant theory, were successful in helping to improve non-studying and disruptive behaviors in ghetto schools, found that the introduction of behavior modification

techniques resulted in high rates of studying behavior and low rates of non-studying and disruptive behaviors.

The purpose of a study by Niewiadomski (1971) was to determine student perceptions of school discipline practices, the seriousness of the information, and the fairness and the effectiveness of disciplinary actions. He reported that disciplinary practices in the school studied were found to be moderate, with the use of drugs, destruction of school property, and stealing the most serious discipline problems. Disciplinary actions were found to be fair except in cases of disrespect to teachers, forging passes, and stealing. The disciplinary actions were found to be effective except in cases of gambling, lying, and stealing.

Morgan (1955) compared social background of parents with their attitudes on matters of high school discipline, punishment methods, and positive concepts of discipline. He indicated that there seems to be little difference in attitudes by social background factors except in the categories of occupation, family income, and education.

> The greatest number of differences occur in the application of methods of punishment to specific offenses. The least number of differences occur in connection with the positive concepts of discipline. The variety of punishments endorsed seemed to increase directly with the amount of education and the amount of family income. Among the occupational groups, the business and professional parents are most tolerant toward today's youth and least inclined toward severe measures. (p. 756)

In "An Analysis of Personality and Demographic Factors Concerning Students Involved in Disciplinary Problems," Bealer (1967) found that the variables of more significance to discrimination were personal education aspiration, peer parental relationships, rank in class, and impulse expression for males, and involvement in extracurricular activities, rank in class, and religious attendance for females. If individuals' scores were low, it was quite likely that they would be involved in disruptive behavior. The opposite resulted for individuals with high scores.

Bloom (1964), studying the attitudes of mentally retarded students, concluded that there were significant differences in responsibility, emotional stability, self-regard, and attitudes toward work that were attributable to education alone. Life style was a significant predictor of attitudes towards frustration tolerance, schools, and teachers. There were no significant differences among ethnic groups.

Cummins (1964) investigated the effective and cognitive characteristics of disruptive students. He reported no difference in the cognitive characteristics of disruptive and non-disruptive students. It was also found that affective characteristics did not differ in disciplinary and non-disciplinary students. He concluded that disciplinary and non-disciplinary students are

essentially similar in their affective and cognitive characteristics.

Scurry (1976), studying the relationship among black senior high school students and their perceptions of alienation and internal and external control, indicated:

1. Disruptive high school students perceived themselves as more alienated than the non-disruptive high-school students.
2. Disruptive high school students did not perceive themselves anymore internal-external than the non-disruptive high school students. (p. 3541)

Wilde (1976) sought to determine the efficacy of punishing videotaped models as a tool to diminish the incidence of disruptive behavior in two junior high school classes. He concluded that modeled punishment had no effect on the incidence of disruptive behavior upon the experiment's subjects.

Literature on Socio-economic Status

Coleman (1966) found in his famous study, that all schools are very similar in the way they affect achievement when the socio-economic background of the students is taken into consideration. He also observed that socio-economic factors have great importance in predicting academic achievement. Furthermore, he reported that the family economic level has the highest relation to achievement for all minority groups.

Minority students also are more affected by the quality of the school they attend:

> The average white student's achievement seems to be less affected by the strength or weakness of his school's facilities, curriculums, and teachers than is the average minority pupil's. To put it another way, the achievement of minority pupils depends more on the schools they attend than does the achievement of majority pupils. (p. 22)

Hollingshead (1949) noted that the higher rate of failure among lower class students is the combined result of the values of the lower class students and the bias of the teachers who are more inclined to extend extra help to middle and upper class students.

Hindelang (1971) considered age and sex as variables in studying the versatility of delinquent behavior, i.e., whether children engaging in delinquent behavior tend to perform a wide variety of acts or whether they confine themselves to a very narrow range of acts. He found that females tend to engage in a wider variety of delinquent acts than males and that males tend to engage with greater frequency than females in street-gang-related delinquencies. His study was supportive of the belief that socio-economics may play a part in disruptive behavior, because street gangs tend to exist in lower socio-economic neighborhoods.

Reissman (1953) addressed the problem of the relationship between aspiration and socio-economic

status. A person's peer group has an effect on the interchange between social situations and aspiration levels.

McPartland and McDill (1975) of the Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, pointed out that "a student's success and status in school have a unique relationship with the probability of serious offenses, over and above what is accounted for by family background and academic ability" (p. 10).

An article by Lufler (1978), reporting the results of a two-year study conducted by the Center for Public Representation in Madison, Wisconsin, pointed out that teachers felt "discipline problems are an extension of out-of-school problems" (p. 424). The study also found that most of the disruptive students came from single-parent homes, from low socio-economic status homes and/or from families that move frequently. Data analysis revealed that disruptive students tended to receive lower grades and were less involved in school activities.

Brookover et al. (1967) concluded that the influence of self-concept on achievement was possibly greater than that of mental ability. In previous

studies (1964 and 1965), he and others had found that a student's overall ability self-concept is related to his achievement in school. Cook (1970) found that black, low socio-economic, disadvantaged students had significantly lower self-concepts than those of their white counterparts. Branch (1974) discovered that disruptive students in middle schools had lower self-concepts than those of non-disruptive students in the same school environment.

Jencks (1972) pointed out that there are many who believe that the school cannot improve the achievement of the disadvantaged students, that academic performance is predetermined by the socio-economic status of a student's parents.

In the study "Toward Equal Educational Opportunity" (1972), conducted by the United States Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, it was observed that advantaged children and children from deprived homes begin their education at different starting lines:

> A child's socioeconomic status, his parents' educational level and occupational status, the extent to which he and his family are the victims of racial discrimination and all the other elements of his home environment determine in large measure his performance in school and his success or failure in life. (p. 5)

An article by Pearl (1965) observed that:

> . . . There appears to be a general consensus that low income youth, when contrasted with

> more affluent counterparts, are characterized by the following: a poorer self-image, a greater sense of powerlessness, a more fatalistic attitude toward life, a lack of future orientation, and a greater potential for impulsive "acting out." (p. 89)

This statement is highly significant since it singles out a variable, low income, as the most important factor in developing the attitudes most often associated with disruptive youth.

There is no doubt that all the variables are somewhat interrelated. The question becomes how to rank them in order of their importance as predictors of disruptive behavior.

According to Sexton (1961) the failure rate among elementary school children whose families earned $3,000 or less per year was six times greater than the failure rate among those families earning $9,000 per year. This disproportion in the figures cannot be attributed adequately to mere chance. Some of the students falling in the lowest income-level families had children manifesting serious behavior problems--failing in elementary school studies and engaging in disruptive behavior--while no problem children were found among the families within the highest income bracket.

An article by Miller (1958) about the etiology of delinquency suggested that adolescent members of

street corner groups in lower class communities, commit delinquent acts in an attempt to adhere to the forms of behavior and to the standards of value of their community. The article further concluded that "many lower class individuals feel that their lives are subject to a set of forces over which they have relatively little control" (p. 11) and therefore when they are faced with alternatives of accomplishing similar objectives, the non-law-abiding avenue offers greater and faster return for a smaller investment of their energy.

Schonfeld (1968) contended "socio-economic affluence has been found to play an important preparatory and determining role in how youth copes with his adolescent crisis" (p. 492). Does this mean that high income youths are definitely better adjusted than their lower income counterparts? Not necessarily; it means only that several factors come into play when there is definite family affluence, which the low income youth does not have. He added that these factors include the extent to which each youth derives consequences from unsocial or anti-social behavior, i.e. in the case of a high-income family adolescent, his likelihood of escaping repercussions from such

acts, since the family usually has the means to retain, and does indeed retain, skilled lawyers, or possibly pay damages, causing charges to be dropped through technicalities, is a possibility not available to lower-income-family adolescents. On the other hand, the lower-income-family youth almost inevitably has to shoulder the responsibility for his actions.

Erickson (1973) considered the importance of socio-economic status in his carefully worded article, "Group Violations, Socioeconomic Status, and Official Delinquency." The author makes a point of emphasizing that almost all delinquent acts are those (1) stemming from lower class children, (2) are a group event predominantly. The first part of this hypothesis exactly agrees with this researcher's viewpoint. The article outlined the study conducted to prove the validity of his hypothesis. Violations of the law by lower class boys are more frequent than violations by higher and middle class boys. This seems to be a pattern that carries over into the adult world.

There is also evidence that lower socio-economic children tend to accrue more arrests and convictions than their higher socio-economic-status counterparts. Erickson supported this tenet by actually quoting a figure of 11% greater proportional share of arrests

for all offenses for low socio-economic-status children as compared with 9% less than their proportional share for middle-class-status children. Higher class children unaccountably accounted for a slightly lower than their proportional share of arrests (less than 2%).

Literature on Ethnicity

The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth (1973) studied the demographic aspects of disruptive youth in order to be able to determine the significance of demographic variables in relationship to disruptive youth in the schools of the State of Florida. Academic variables, race, and socio-economic variables were grouped together as the most prevalent factors. The study suggested that:

> . . . if a pupil was male, black, had a low sixth grade test score, a low grade point average, a low verbal aptitude score and had not been referred for psychological services, he was more likely to become a disruptive student and be either expelled or suspended from school. (p. 9)

Zirkel and Gable (1977) conducted a study to examine the test-retest reliability and construct validity of selected types of self-concept measures. These were non-verbal, verbal, and pictorial scores and observer ratings for black, Puerto Rican, and white adolescents. Results of these measures showed black

students received a greater number of poor ratings and evidenced poorer self-concepts.

Walberg et al. (1974) reported that while blacks rated higher in offenses such as driving without a license, skipping school, and beating up and threatening others, the incidences of the offenses did not show significant differences between blacks and whites. He also observed that there is ethnic bias in the recording and disposition of juvenile cases.

Higgins (1974) proposed that one focus of pre- and in-service training should be the development of more precise objectives for the work of desegregation. In view of all the desegregation-generated hostility caused by placing poor black students in middle-to-high class neighborhood schools, the value of busing seems to be offset by the increase in disruptive behavior.

Studying group disorders in the public schools, Ritterband and Silberstein (1973) found that the presence of black teachers slightly inhibited the occurrences of non-political disorders. They also observed that:

> Equally plausible is the notion that disorder occurs when inexperienced teachers (who tend to teach the non-white pupils) cannot capture their pupils' interest and/or cannot control them. . . . however, no matter what the school characteristic, whether size (presumably implying bureaucratization and impersonality) [or other factor]. (p. 466)

Williams and Gold (1972) found that "white girls are no more or less frequently or seriously delinquent than black girls; and white boys, no more or less frequently delinquent than black boys" (p. 215). They further pointed out that whether a policeman chooses to ignore or not to ignore delinquent behavior may be contingent on such factors as the juvenile's sex, race, and social status. The same factors affect the citizen making the complaint.

White (1968) examined the situation in which urban high school students were observed on the basis of many variables, including (1) father's race; (2) mother's race; (3) father's and mother's occupational prestige; (4) father's and mother's education; (5) grade in school; (6) grade point average, (7) sex. The findings about race evidenced that black students were more alienated than white youths; black females evidenced more alienation than males.

Literature on Sex

Touliatos and Lindholm (1976) reported that being a female student in regular classes was a predictor of good behavior, being a male student from a high-social-class home in regular classes was a predictor of not having personality disorders. In contrast, being in the higher grades and from a lower socio-economic-status home in regular classes was a predictor of disruptive behavior.

Howard (1978), in a study of factors on school vandalism, concluded that the middle school or junior high school student is the age group within which most vandals have been found. He also pointed out that vandalism is almost exclusively a male activity, and there is a high correlation between delinquent students and educational deficiency. The study further indicated that many parents associate school discipline with the school principal.

Poorman, Donnerstein, and Donnerstein (1976) noted that males as opposed to females tend to engage in, as well as provoke, higher levels of aggressive behavior. Results of this study indicated that aggression between females was relatively stable over age. In contrast, aggression between males increased significantly. They suggested that this increase is the result of this kind of behavior being rewarded by peers and parents.

In a study designed to investigate the touch interactions between junior high school students, Willis and Reeves (1976) noted that females were observed to use fists and other aggressive touches, something that had not been observed in an earlier study. They concluded that "the increased aggressive touch may be a reflection of the increased aggression of young females that has been reported in recent years" (p. 91).

Rice (1975) expounded on the effects of task-focused and approval-focused discipline techniques. How is the

target of the discipline viewed by his observing peers? Two variables were studied--sex and type of desist (command). The scores of the personality-trait of the student were studied as well as the personality-trait rating of the teacher, the confidence in the rating of the child and of the teacher. The students who hastened to the task-focused desists differed significantly in their responses on the measures from those who heard the approval-focused desists. Neither the sex of the rater nor the sex of the ratee and type of desist interaction was significant (p 10). This seems to bear upon the question, raised earlier, regarding the possibility of sex as a significant predictor of disruptive behavior.

Literature on School Location

In the Teacher Opinion Poll of the National Education Association (1974), 5.4% of the sampled urban secondary school personnel reported they had experienced on-the-job physical assaults, while only 2.0% of the sample's rural and suburban personnel said they had similar experiences.

Koch (1975) found that the rate of teacher assault and personal property damage has increased dramatically in urban school districts.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) considered delinquent behavior primarily centered upon lower class, urban, male adolescents. It is interesting to note the very real and pronounced difference existing between the incidence of disruptive behavior in lower class urban and lower class rural adolescents. The answers may be that the rural environment does not pose a threat of hostility to the low-income-family youth because he will not be likely to be confronted with and defeated by middle or upper class children in social, academic, and other achievement areas, but will be instead confronted with children of like backgrounds and similar likelihood of success levels.

Literature on School Size

Kelly (1978) suggested that observed physical conflict between students will increase as relative school population density increases. He further contended:

> The presence of such . . . student populations and a variety of recent professional and public observations concerning school violence, absenteeism, and the decline of achievement standards suggests that some correspondence between these factors may indeed exist. . . . The current literature indicates that student conflict and corollary suspensions are far more prevalent in large urban secondary schools than in suburban or rural schools. . . . In its report on causes of student conflict in California's schools, the California State Department of Education cited school overcrowding as a major causal factor, noting that in schools where overcrowding is severe, the students report it is tiring to go to classes which are too large, to stand in lines to eat in the cafeteria or use the

> restrooms and to line up to get a locker. The attendant noise and fatigue (alone) provide a climate for unrest. (pp. 152 & 156)

Baron (1975) studying the correspondence of human overcrowding in living space to specific social pathologies, reported public schools reflecting more consistently adverse patterns of overcrowding.

The size and enrollment of the school has been associated with discipline problems, violence, and vandalism. Kingston and Gentry (1977) noted that students in large high schools found it difficult to identify with their schools and seldom participated in school activities. The authors observed that this may be the cause of disciplinary problems. In another study, DeBuzna (1974) reported that the rate of vandalism increased as the number of students enrolled in the school increased.

The studies of The Teachers Task Force (1974) indicated a negative relationship between school overcrowding and academic achievement, while a study conducted by Davis (1972) found that students in medium to large size high schools (2,000-4,000) evidenced lower grades than students in small size high schools.

Literature on the School Principal

Goldman (1961) indicated that teachers in schools with high rates of vandalism described their principal

as weak and casual, while their counterparts in schools with low rates of vandalism characterized the principal as strong and democratic.

An article by Love (1977) contended that, in integrated schools, the failure to diagnose problems with accuracy originates in the inability of school administrators to view themselves in a new perspective. They cannot understand why their policies and teaching methodologies, effective in the past, no longer work, and they refuse to change because of an ideological barrier made up of concepts of differences; i.e.,

1. differences in their minds that translate into deficits for minority students
2. holding low expectations for the academic performance of minority children
3. using inappropriate materials
4. poor interpersonal relationships between teachers and minority students
5. biased counseling practices of teachers and principals as well as counselors
6. failure to relate to minority students as individuals
7. bias in the administration of discipline.

Love indicated what evidence to look for in order to ascertain if these behavior patterns existed in any

particular school. According to the article, illustrations of biased administration of discipline are:

1. To assume when there are behavior problems that minority students started it or know something about it.

2. To punish a student who is not involved in disruptive behavior for not telling all he knows

3. Ignoring white students' misbehavior while disciplining minority students for any rule infraction

4. Using white cultural norms and values in the administration of discipline

5. Low rate of suspension and expulsion for white students in contrast to high rate for their minority counterparts, with a longer period of suspension for the latter

6. Higher rate of disciplinary action for minority pupils as a result of subjective decisions by teachers and administrators.

Shuttlesworth and Evans (1974) stressed that "the principal must always keep foremost in his mind that he is the principal of all the students regardless of race, color, or creed" (p. 50). To illustrate what can happen if the principal fails to follow this, they pointed out that in one high school of about 2,000 students, 80% white and 20% black:

> . . . several white teachers sent far more black students than white students to the principal's office for disciplinary reasons. When the black

> students felt that the white principal was defending what they considered "racism" (which the principal might or might not have been doing), they began to polarize, using as a slogan: "We'd better start sticking together!" Polarization first began among those blacks who had been sent to the office, and rapidly spread to include almost all other black students. No race riot broke out, but hostility was strong and rumors of rioting lasted for weeks. (p. 50)

In implementing a group therapy program to help disruptive students, Webster (1974) stressed the importance of obtaining the support of the school principal for this type of intervention to be accepted by the school in general, its effectiveness and success.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed selected literature on disruptive behavior; ethnicity, socio-economic status, and sex as student variables, and location, size, and the principal as school variables. Some of the research literature reviewed in this chapter established the basis for this present study.

Significant findings pertinent to this study have been included in this chapter, i.e., relevant to the student socio-economic status (Hollingshead, 1949; Reissman, 1953; Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972; McPartland and McDill, 1975), ethnicity (The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth, 1973; Walberg et al., 1974; Zirkel and Gable, 1977), sex (Rice, 1975; Touliatos and Lindholm, 1976;

Howard, 1978). Further relevant findings, related to school location were included, i.e. (The Teacher Opinion Poll of the National Education Association, 1974; Koch, 1975), size (Baron, 1975; Kelly, 1978), and the principal (Shuttlesworth and Evans, 1974; Love, 1977). Furthermore, most of the reported research serves as background from which perspectives can be established in evaluating this study.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study used a comparative survey method to investigate the relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students in tri-ethnic junior high schools. Three variables of student characteristics, socio-economic class, ethnicity, and sex were tested in order to determine whether they were predictors of disruptive behavior in tri-ethnic junior high schools. Also three variables of school characteristics, size, location, and ethnicity of the principal, were tested in order to determine whether they were factors in the incidence of disruptive behavior in tri-ethnic junior high schools. The students variables were tested by intergroup and intragroup comparison techniques in order to determine whether disruptive junior high school students can be predicted by any of the variables independently or in any combination of the three. The school variables were tested to determine whether the variables, as a single unit, were predictive of disruptive behavior in the junior high school. In addition, the previously mentioned student variables were tested as to whether each together with each of the school variables was predictive of disruptive behavior in tri-ethnic junior high schools.

Hypotheses

Three variables concerning characteristics of junior high school students were identified. This study analyzed the interactions of these variables with each of the three variables concerning characteristics of tri-ethnic junior high schools.

The student variables were socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex. The school variables were: size, location, and ethnic origin of the principal. The dependent variable in this study was disruptive behavior.

In order to test the interactions of the student and school variables, the following null hypotheses were formulated

H_1--There is no significant difference between the socio-economic position, the ethnicity, and the sex of the student, the location, the size, and the ethnic origin of the principal of the school, and the frequency of disruptive students.

H_2--There is no significant difference between the proportion of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different socio-economic positions.

H_3--There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different ethnic origins.

H_4--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different sexes.

H_5--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_6--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle-socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_7--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_8--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of lower socio-economic position.

H_9--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of middle socio-economic position.

H_{10}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of upper socio-economic position.

H_{11}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students of different sexes.

H_{12}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students of different sexes.

H_{13}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students of different sexes.

H_{14}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{15}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{16}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{17}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{18}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{19}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{20}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{21}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{22}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{23}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive

and non-disruptive students in schools of different sizes.

H_{24}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{25}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{26}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of higher socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{27}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools of different sizes.

H_{28}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools of different sizes.

H_{29}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools of different sizes.

H_{30}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools of different sizes.

H_{31}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools of different sizes.

H_{32}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{33}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{34}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{35}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{36}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{37}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{38}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic origin students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{39}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{40}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{41}--There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in different grades.

Procedures

Measures of socio-economic status, ethnicity, sex, and disruptive behavior of the students were obtained from information provided by selected tri-ethnic

junior high schools. The group of identified disruptive junior high school students was compared to the group of identified non-disruptive junior high school students on the three variables of socio-economic position, ethnicity, and sex. Measures of three variables of the school characteristics, size, location, and the ethnic origin of the principal were also obtained. The relationship between the six independent variables and the dependent variable was statistically tested. In addition, combinations of the six independent variables were statistically tested, as well as within group measures of all the independent variables. The subjects, the instruments, the method, and the statistical analyses utilized in this study will follow.

Subjects

There are 46 junior high schools in Dade County with over 61,000 students, with approximately equal numbers of males and females. Of these 46 junior high schools, 26 have a tri-ethnic student population in which each ethnic group has a representation of at least 6% of the total school population. The ethnic composition of the junior high school population is listed in Table No. 1.

Permission was obtained from the Dade County Schools Research Committee to conduct the study in selected

TABLE 1

ETHNICITY

Ethnicity	Students	Percentage
White Americans	24,199	39.30
Black Americans	15,879	25.79
Hispanic Origin	21,226	34.48
Other Minorities	265	0.43
Total	61,569	100.00

tri-ethnic junior high schools. Subjects were drawn from 12 junior high schools in Dade County with a total enrollment of 14,281 students. Half of the junior high schools were located in urban Dade County and the other half in suburban Dade County.

Of the 12 junior high schools selected for this study, 2 were of small size, 7 were of medium size, and 3 were of large size. Fifty percent (50%) of the junior high school principals were white American and the other 50% were non-white Americans.

A stratified random sample of 30 black American, 30 white American, and 30 Hispanic-origin students was selected from each of the 12 junior high schools. Half of the students in each ethnic group were male and the other half female. There was a total of 1,080 subjects

in this study. This represented approximately 1.75% of the total junior high population and 7.6% of the enrollment of the selected junior high schools in this study. Of the students selected in the sample, 270 were in the 7th grade, 407 were in the 8th grade, 396 in the 9th grade, and 7 failed to indicate the grade. Only 120 were in the upper socio-economic position, with 468 in the middle, and 492 in the lower socio-economic positions. School authorities identified 123 students as disruptive and 950 as non-disruptive. Most of them (630) attended medium size schools, with 270 in large schools, and 180 in small schools.

TABLE 2

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COMPLAINTS REPORTED TO THE DADE COUNTY SCHOOLS SECURITY ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT IN THE 1976/1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Offense	No of Complaints
Rape	1
Robbery	82
Assault	660
Theft	636
Arson	41
Vandalism	488
Possessing a weapon	48
Sex offense	22
Marijuana	91
Disorderly conduct	269
Total	2,338

School No. 1 (for the purposes of this study the schools will be identified, 1, 2, 3 . . . 12), large in size, with a white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,520 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 20% black American, 72% white American, 7% Hispanic-origin, and 1% others. Approximately 13% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 2, small in size, with a non-white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 758 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 45% black American, 17% white American, and 37% Hispanic origin. Approximately 71% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 3, medium in size, with a white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,431 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 42% black American, 17% white American, and 42% Hispanic origin. Approximately 60% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 4, small in size, with a non-white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 497 7th grade students. The ethnic composition

of the school population was 32% black American, 46% white American, and 22% Hispanic origin. Approximately 32% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 5, large in size, with a white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,570 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 26% black American, 6% white American, and 68% Hispanic origin. Approximately 69% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 6, large in size, with a white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,644 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 20% black American, 7% white American, and 73% Hispanic origin. Approximately 48% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 7, medium in size, with a non-white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,204 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 65% black American, 16% white American, and 19% Hispanic origin. Approximately 64% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 8, medium in size, with a white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,291 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 51% black American, 29% white American, 19% Hispanic origin, and 1% other. Approximately 54% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 9, medium in size, with a non-white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,380 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 16% black American, 73% white American, 10% Hispanic origin, and 1% other. Approximately 23% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 10, medium in size, with a white principal, located in urban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,277 8th and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 40% black American, 37% white American, and 23% Hispanic origin. Approximately 23% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 11, medium in size, with a non-white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,316 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 37% black American, 46% white American, and 17% Hispanic origin. Approximately 34% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

School No. 12, medium in size, with a non-white principal, located in suburban Dade County, had an enrollment of 1,408 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students. The ethnic composition of the school population was 44% black American, 31% white American, 24% Hispanic origin, and 1% other. Approximately 57% of the students were determined to be economically disadvantaged.

There were 12,956 students suspended from Dade County junior high schools during the first three quinmesters of the 1977/78 school year. Eight hundred forty-three (843) of them were enrolled in the 12 junior high schools that participated in this study.

Instruments

In Chapter I, the questionnaire used to gather the data needed for this study was discussed. However, the information needed to determine the socio-economic position of the subjects had to be processed. The Two Factor Index of Social Position (Hollingshead, 1957) was used to compute an index of socio-economic class. The index was developed by Hollingshead to "meet the need for an objective, easily applicable procedure to estimate the position individuals occupy in the status structure of our society" (p. 235).

The two factors used in the index were the occupation and the educational level of the head of the

household. The occupations are ranked in seven categories.

> . . . (1) executives and proprietors of large concerns and major professionals; (2) managers and proprietors of medium concerns and minor professionals; (3) administrative personnel of large concerns, owners of small independent businesses, and semiprofessionals; (4) owners of little businesses, clerical and sales workers, and technicians; (5) skilled workers; (6) semiskilled workers; and (7) unskilled workers. (p. 235)

This scale is based on the premise that society gives distinct values to different occupations because they reflect the skill and power of individuals. The educational scale is divided into seven levels:

> . . . (1) graduate professional training (persons who completed a recognized course which led to the receipt of a graduate degree); (2) standard college or university graduation (individuals who had completed a four-year college or university course leading to a recognized college degree); (3) partial college training (individuals who had completed at least one year but not a full college course); (4) high-school graduation (all secondary-school graduates, whether from a private preparatory school, public high school, trade school, or parochial high school); (5) partial high school (individuals who had completed the tenth or eleventh grades but not the high school course); (6) junior high school (individuals who had completed the seventh, eighth, or ninth grades); (7) less than seven years of school (individuals who had completed less than seven grades irrespective of the amount of education received. (p. 236)

This scale is based on the premise that people with similar education tend to have similar attitudes, tastes, and behavior patterns.

In order to calculate the index of social position, the value for occupation is multiplied by a factor

weight of seven. The value for education is multiplied by a factor weight of four, and both products are added. The scores range from a low of 11 to a high of 77. In this study the scores were divided into three levels.

TABLE 3

SCORES USED TO DETERMINE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION

Socio-Economic Position	Total Score
Lower	11-22
Middle	23-51
Upper	52-77

The questionnaire used in this study provided information on the occupation and the education of both parents. If information for both parents was given, it was assumed that the father was the head of the household. When the only information given in the questionnaire was "unemployed" and no additional information could be obtained, the student was assumed to be of lower socio-economic status.

Methods

During the spring of 1978 permission to conduct this study was requested from 14 junior high school

principals. Only one refused to give his authorization; hence, because of the research design, it was also necessary to eliminate a second school that had been paired with it.

Questionnaires with the names of the students selected for the study already written upon them were delivered to the 12 junior high schools that had accepted the invitation to participate in the study. A conference was held with the assistant principal for guidance of each school in order to ensure good cooperation and better understanding of the study. It was requested that the assistant principal randomly replace any subject no longer in the school. The replacement would be chosen with the same demographic characteristics.

The questionnaires were completed by the students under the supervision of a guidance counselor. The assistant principal in charge of discipline reviewed the questionnaires once they had been completed by the students in order to ascertain that Item No. 8 (Was the student suspended?) had been answered accurately.

Before being returned by the schools, the students' names were detached from the questionnaires, because of a requirement of the Dade County Schools Research Committee designed to maintain the privacy rights of the students. Furthermore, after receiving the questionnaires, the names of the schools were also detached, in order to

comply with the request to maintain the names of the schools which participated in this study in anonymity and these were placed in envelopes labeled:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Principal	Non/W	Non/W	Non/W	W	W	W	W
Size	M	S	M	L	M	M	L
Location	U	U	S	U	S	U	S

When all questionnaires were returned, the data were coded and keypunched.

Statistical Analysis

Hypothesis 1 was tested in order to determine if several student and school independent variables were predictors of disruptive behavior. Multiple regression was used in the statistical analysis. Kerlinger (1964) pointed out:

> Multiple regression is close to the heart of scientific investigation. It is also fundamental in statistics and inference, and is tightly tied to basic and powerful mathematical methods. From the researcher's point of view, moreover, it is useful and practical: it does its analytic job successfully and efficiently. (p. 630)

Discussing this statistical technique as an inferential tool, Nie et al. (1975) wrote:

> Through multiple regression techniques the researcher could obtain a prediction equation that indicates how scores on the independent variables could be weighted and summed to obtain the best prediction of the dependent variable. (p. 321)

Because of the nominal-scale nature of the six independent variables and the dichotomous nominal-scale nature of the dependent variable, "dummy" variables had to be used.

Hypotheses 2 through 41 were formulated to test intergroup and intragroup relationships. Chi square was used in the statistical analysis because it is a test of statistical significance that helps to determine if there is a systematic relationship between two variables.

Summary

The focus of this chapter was the design of this study. The hypotheses were formulated, the procedures were explained, the subjects as well as the instruments were described, and the methods used in the statistical analysis were outlined. The methods of sampling and data collection were previously discussed in Chapter I. An analysis of the results is discussed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The major purpose of the present study was to ascertain if there was a relationship among certain student characteristics, certain school characteristics, and disruptive behavior. Three independent variables of student characteristics and three independent variables of school characteristics were combined to formulate 39 null hypotheses. Because the information was available, a fourth independent variable of student characteristics, school grade, was used by itself in formulating one null hypothesis and in combination with the other independent variables for a total of 41 null hypotheses.

Two statistical techniques were used to analyze the data in this study. The forward (stepwise) inclusion approach of multiple linear regression was used in testing the first hypothesis for predictability. Chi square was used to test the rest of the hypotheses for relationship.

The findings of this study are grouped into six sections. Section I presents the findings of testing hypothesis one, which tries to determine whether any of the independent variables or any combination of them are predictors of disruptive behavior. Section II presents

the results of testing the independent variables of socio-economic position, ethnicity, and sex of the students formulated in hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. Section III presents the results of testing the independent variable of the ethnicity of the principal and its relationship with students' variables formulated in hypotheses 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. Section IV presents the results of testing the independent variable of the size of the school and its relationship with student variables formulated in hypotheses 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31. Section V presents the results of testing the independent variable of the location of the school and its relationship with student variables formulated on hypotheses 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40. Section VI presents the results of testing the independent variable of the students' grade placement.

Section I

> H_1, There is no significant difference between the socio-economic position, the ethnicity, the grade, and the sex of the student; the location, the size, and the ethnic origin of the principal of the school and the frequency of disruptive students.

Multiple regression was run to determine whether the independent variables were predictors of disruptive behavior. The equation used in this statistical technique was:

$$Y = C + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \ldots + B_KX_K$$

The best predictors obtained in the regression analysis were (1) socio-economic position--lower; (2) sex--male; (3) ethnicity--non-Hispanic; (4) grade--non-eighth grader.

The values obtained in the regression analysis produced the following equation:

$$Y = 0.02788 + .18075X_1 + .8506X_2 - .6398X_3 - .4653X_4$$

where Y is the predicted dependent variable, X_1 lower socio-economic position, X_2 male, H_3 Hispanic origin, and X_4 eighth grade.

The results of the analysis of variance in each step of the multiple regression showed the variables listed in Table 4 significant at the 0.01 level.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN THE MULTIPLE REGRESSION

Variable	B	Beta	Standard Error B
Lower socio-economic position	.18075	.28336	0.01872
Male	.8506	.13388	0.01840
Hispanic	-.6398	-.09495	0.01976
Grade 8	-.4653	-.07098	0.01900

TABLE 4 (continued)

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	F
1. Lower socio-economic position	1	84.1045
2. Male sex	2	54.49337
3. Hispanic ethnic origin	3	39.89209
4. Eighth grade	4	31.55811

Since the null hypothesis encompassed all the independent variables, it is not rejected. However, it can be said that the student with most probability of being suspended is of lower socio-economic position, male, not of Hispanic origin nor in the eighth grade.

Section II

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the rest of the hypotheses in this study. It determines whether a relationship exists between two variables. The following formula was used in this statistical technique:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{\left(f_o^i - f_e^i\right)^2}{f_e^i}$$

where f_o^i is the observed frequency in each cell and f_e^i is the expected frequency.

The hypotheses in this section test the relationship between disruptive behavior and the socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of the student.

H_2, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different socio-economic positions.

TABLE 5

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITIONS

		Lower	Middle	Upper	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	390	448	119	957
	Row Pct.	40.8	46.8	12.4	88.6
	Col. Pct.	79.3	95.7	99.2	
	Tot. Pct.	36.1	41.5	11.0	
Disruptive	Count	102	20	1	123
	Row Pct.	82.9	16.3	0.8	11.4
	Col. Pct.	20.7	4.3	0.8	
	Tot. Pct.	9.4	1.9	0.1	
Total Column		492	468	120	1080
Total Column Pct.		45.6	43.3	11.1	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive behavior and students' socio-economic position. The obtained chi square of 79.28 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of less than 0.0001. Therefore,

the null hypothesis is rejected. In order to determine which of the proportions of lower, middle, and upper socio-economic position was statistically significant, the z test formula for significance of difference between proportions (Glass and Stanley 1970, p. 325) was used.

$$z = \frac{P_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{f_1 + f_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{f_1 + f_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

The proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle and upper socio-economic position obtained a z value of 1.88, not high enough to be significant at the .05 level.

There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level between the proportion of disruptive students of lower socio-economic position and the proportions of disruptive students of middle and upper socio-economic positions.

> H_3, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the ethnicity of the students. The obtained chi square of 13.59 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of .0011. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The

TABLE 6

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT ETHNIC ORIGINS

		Black	Hispanic	White	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	301	326	330	957
	Row Pct.	31.5	34.1	34.5	88.6
	Col. Pct.	83.6	90.6	91.7	
	Tot. Pct.	27.9	30.2	30.6	
Disruptive	Count	59	34	30	123
	Row Pct.	48.0	27.6	24.4	11.4
	Col. Pct.	16.4	9.4	8.3	
	Tot. Pct.	5.5	3.1	2.8	
Total Column		360	360	360	1080
Total Column Pct.		33.3	33.3	33.3	100.0

proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of white American and Hispanic ethnic origins obtained a z value of 0.516 which is not statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level between the proportion of disruptive and non-disruptive black American and white American students and the proportions of black American and Hispanic-origin students.

H_4, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different sex.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive

TABLE 7

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SEXES

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	453	504	957
	Row Pct.	47.3	52.7	88.6
	Col. Pct.	83.9	93.3	
	Total Pct.	41.9	46.7	
Disruptive	Count	87	36	123
	Row Pct.	70.7	29.3	11.4
	Col. Pct.	16.1	6.7	
	Total Pct.	8.1	3.3	
Total Column		540	540	1080
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

students of different sex. The obtained chi square of 22.94 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of less than 0.0001. Of the students identified as disruptive 87 were male and 36 female. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

H_5, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position and different

TABLE 8

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY ETHNICITY

		Black	Hispanic	White	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	150	178	62	390
	Row Pct.	38.5	45.6	15.9	79.3
	Col. Pct.	73.9	85.6	76.5	
	Tot. Pct.	30.5	36.2	12.6	
Disruptive	Count	53	30	19	102
	Row Pct.	52.0	29.4	18.6	20.7
	Col. Pct.	26.1	14.4	23.5	
	Tot. Pct.	10.8	6.1	3.9	
Total Column		203	208	81	492
Total Column Pct.		41.3	42.3	16.5	100.0

ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 8.97 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.0113. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The proportions of black American and white American disruptive and non-disruptive students obtained a z value of 0.46, which is not statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students and the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students. A high z value of 1.85 was obtained between the proportion of disruptive and

non-disruptive white American students and disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students, but it failed to reach the value of 1.96 needed to be significant at the 0.05 level.

H_6, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

TABLE 9

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF MIDDLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY ETHNICITY

		Black	Hispanic	White	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	125	121	202	448
	Row Pct.	27.9	27.0	45.1	95.7
	Col. Pct.	96.2	96.8	94.8	
	Tot. Pct.	26.7	25.9	43.2	
Disruptive	Count	5	4	11	20
	Row Pct.	25.0	20.0	55.0	4.3
	Col. Pct.	3.8	3.2	5.2	
	Tot. Pct.	1.1	0.9	2.4	
Total Column		130	125	213	468
Total Column Pct.		27.8	26.7	45.5	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position and different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 0.82 with 2

degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.662. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_7, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

TABLE 10

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY ETHNICITY

		Black	Hispanic	White	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	26	27	66	119
	Row Pct.	21.8	22.7	55.5	99.2
	Col. Pct.	96.3	100.0	100.0	
	Tot. Pct.	21.7	22.5	55.0	
Disruptive	Count	1	0	0	1
	Row Pct.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
	Col. Pct.	3.7	0.0	0.0	
	Tot. Pct.	0.8	0.0	0.0	
Total Column		27	27	66	120
Total Column Pct.		22.5	22.5	55.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position and different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 3.47 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.176. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Only one student

in this socio-economic status was identified as disruptive, which represents 0.8% of the total number of students in this group. Since one of the requirements of chi square, that the expected value of any cell never be less than 5, is not met, a z test was conducted with the following not statistically significant results:

Black Americans and white Americans $z = 1.57$

Black Americans and Hispanic-origin students

$z = 1.008$

H_3, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of lower socio-economic position.

TABLE 11

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	182	208	390
	Row Pct.	46.7	53.3	79.3
	Col. Pct.	71.4	87.8	
	Tot. Pct.	37.0	42.3	
Disruptive	Count	73	29	102
	Row Pct.	71.6	28.4	20.7
	Col. Pct.	28.6	12.2	
	Tot. Pct.	14.8	5.9	
Total Column		255	237	492
Total Column Pct.		51.8	48.2	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic status and different sexes. The obtained chi square of 19.1 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of less than 0.0001. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Only 12.2% of the female student sample in this socio-economic position was identified as disruptive in contrast to 28.6% of the male student sample.

H_9, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of middle socio-economic position.

TABLE 12

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF MIDDLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	215	233	448
	Row Pct.	48.0	52.0	95.7
	Col. Pct.	94.3	97.1	
	Tot. Pct.	45.9	49.8	
Disruptive	Count	13	7	20
	Row Pct.	65.0	35.0	4.3
	Col. Pct.	5.7	2.9	
	Tot. Pct.	2.8	1.5	
Total Column		228	240	468
Total Column Pct.		48.7	51.3	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position and different sexes. The obtained chi square of 1.59 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.208. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{10}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of upper socio-economic position.

TABLE 13

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS OF UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	56	63	119
	Row Pct.	47.1	52.9	99.2
	Col. Pct.	98.2	100.0	
	Tot. Pct.	46.7	52.5	
Disruptive	Count	1	0	1
	Row Pct.	100.0	0.0	0.8
	Col. Pct.	1.8	0.0	
	Tot. Pct.	0.8	0.0	
Total Column		57	63	120
Total Column Pct.		47.5	52.5	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students

of upper socio-economic position and different sexes. The obtained chi square of 0.003 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.96. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. As was stated before, only 1 student was identified as disruptive in this socio-economic position. Since the chi square requirement, that the expected value of any cell never be less than 5, is not met, a z test was conducted. The value of 1.08 was not statistically significant.

H_{11}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students of different sexes.

TABLE 14

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE BLACK STUDENTS BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	137	164	301
	Row Pct.	45.5	54.5	83.6
	Col. Pct.	76.1	91.1	
	Tot. Pct.	38.1	45.6	
Disruptive	Count	43	16	59
	Row Pct.	72.9	27.1	16.4
	Col. Pct.	23.9	8.9	
	Tot. Pct.	11.9	4.4	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive black American students of different sexes. The obtained chi square of 13.7 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0002. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Only 5.5% of the black American female students were identified as disruptive in contrast to 11.9% of the black American male students.

H_{12}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students of different sexes.

TABLE 15

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE WHITE AMERICAN STUDENTS BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	160	170	330
	Row Pct.	48.5	51.5	91.7
	Col. Pct.	88.9	94.4	
	Tot. Pct.	44.4	47.2	
Disruptive	Count	20	10	30
	Row Pct.	66.7	33.3	8.3
	Col. Pct.	11.1	5.6	
	Tot. Pct.	5.6	2.8	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive white American students of different sexes. The obtained chi square of 2.945 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0861. Although 11.9% of the males, in contrast to 4.4% of the females in this group were identified as disruptive, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{13}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students of different sexes.

TABLE 16

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE HISPANIC-ORIGIN STUDENTS BY SEX

		Male	Female	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	156	170	326
	Row Pct.	47.9	52.1	90.6
	Col. Pct.	86.7	94.4	
	Tot. Pct.	43.3	47.2	
Disruptive	Count	24	10	34
	Row Pct.	70.6	29.4	9.4
	Col. Pct.	13.3	5.6	
	Tot. Pct.	6.7	2.8	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students of different sexes. The obtained chi square of 5.49 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0191. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Only 10 female Hispanic-origin students were identified as disruptive in contrast to 24 males in this group.

Section III

Hypothesis 14 tests the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The rest of the hypotheses in this section test this school variable with each of the student variables.

> H_{14}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 0.147 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.7016. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

> H_{15}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

TABLE 17

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS WITH PRINCIPALS OF DIFFERENT ETHNIC ORIGINS

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	476	481	957
	Row Pct.	49.7	50.3	88.6
	Col. Pct.	88.1	89.1	
	Tot. Pct.	44.1	44.5	
Disruptive	Count	64	59	123
	Row Pct.	52.0	48.0	11.4
	Col. Pct.	11.9	10.9	
	Tot. Pct.	5.9	5.5	
Total Column		540	540	1080
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

TABLE 18

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	175	215	390
	Row Pct.	44.9	55.1	79.3
	Col. Pct.	75.1	83.0	
	Tot. Pct.	35.6	43.7	
Disruptive	Count	58	44	102
	Row Pct.	56.9	43.1	20.7
	Col. Pct.	24.9	17.0	
	Tot. Pct.	11.8	8.9	
Total Column		233	259	492
Total Column Pct.		47.4	52.6	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive lower socio-economic position students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 4.195 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0406. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Of the students identified as disruptive in this socio-economic position, 24.9% of the sample attended schools with white principals and 17% of the sample attended schools with principals of other ethnic origins.

H_{16}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

TABLE 19

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MIDDLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	237	211	448
	Row Pct.	52.9	47.1	95.7
	Col. Pct.	97.5	93.8	
	Tot. Pct.	50.6	45.1	
Disruptive	Count	6	14	20
	Row Pct.	30.0	70.0	4.3
	Col. Pct.	2.5	6.2	
	Tot. Pct.	1.3	3.0	
Total Column		243	225	468
Total Column Pct.		51.9	48.1	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive middle socio-economic position students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 3.157 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0756. Of the middle socio-economic status students attending schools with non-white American principals, 6.2% were identified as disruptive in contrast to 2.5% of the students in this group attending schools with white American principals. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

> H_{17}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive upper socio-economic position students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. Since, as previously pointed out, only one student was identified as disruptive in this socio-economic position, the obtained chi square of 0.0045 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.9465, and the null hypothesis is not rejected. A z test was made because the expected value of each cell was not 5 or above. The z of 1.082 was not statistically significant.

TABLE 20

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	64	55	119
	Row Pct.	53.8	46.2	99.2
	Col. Pct.	100.0	98.2	
	Tot. Pct.	53.3	45.8	
Disruptive	Count	0	1	1
	Row Pct.	0.0	100.0	0.8
	Col. Pct.	0.0	1.8	
	Tot. Pct.	0.0	0.8	
Total Column		64	56	120
Total Column Pct.		53.3	46.7	100.0

H_{18}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 3.97 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0462. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. While 37 black American students were identified as disruptive in schools with

TABLE 21

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE BLACK STUDENTS
BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	143	158	301
	Row Pct.	47.5	52.5	83.6
	Col. Pct.	79.4	87.8	
	Tot. Pct.	39.7	43.9	
Disruptive	Count	37	22	59
	Row Pct.	62.7	37.3	16.4
	Col. Pct.	20.6	12.2	
	Tot. Pct.	10.3	6.1	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

white American principals, only 22 were identified in schools with non-white-American principals.

> H_{19}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 8.18 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0042.

TABLE 22

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE WHITE AMERICAN STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	173	157	330
	Row Pct.	52.4	47.6	91.7
	Col. Pct.	96.1	87.2	
	Tot. Pct.	48.1	43.6	
Disruptive	Count	7	23	30
	Row Pct.	23.3	76.7	8.3
	Col. Pct.	3.9	12.8	
	Tot. Pct.	1.9	6.4	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Schools with non-white American principals identified 23 white American students as disruptive while schools with white American principals identified only 7.

H_{20}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 0.812 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of

TABLE 23

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE HISPANIC-ORIGIN STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY OF THE PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	160	166	326
	Row Pct.	49.1	50.9	90.6
	Col. Pct.	88.9	92.2	
	Tot. Pct.	44.4	46.1	
Disruptive	Count	20	14	34
	Row Pct.	58.8	41.2	9.4
	Col. Pct.	11.1	7.8	
	Tot. Pct.	5.6	3.9	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

0.3675. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{21}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 0.0549 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.8149. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{22}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

TABLE 24

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MALE STUDENTS
BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	228	225	453
	Row Pct.	50.3	49.7	83.9
	Col. Pct.	84.4	83.3	
	Tot. Pct.	42.2	41.7	
Disruptive	Count	42	45	87
	Row Pct.	48.3	51.7	16.1
	Col. Pct.	15.6	16.7	
	Tot. Pct.	7.8	8.3	
Total Column		270	270	540
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

TABLE 25

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE FEMALE STUDENTS
BY ETHNICITY OF PRINCIPAL

		White American	Other	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	248	256	504
	Row Pct.	49.2	50.8	93.3
	Col. Pct.	91.9	94.8	
	Tot. Pct.	45.9	47.4	
Disruptive	Count	22	14	36
	Row Pct.	61.1	38.9	6.7
	Col. Pct.	8.1	5.2	
	Tot. Pct.	4.1	2.6	
Total Column		270	270	540
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The obtained chi square of 1.458 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.227. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Section IV

Hypothesis 23 tests the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools of different sizes. The rest of the hypotheses in this section test this school variable with each of the student variables.

H_{23}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 26

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF DIFFERENT SIZES

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	157	558	242	957
	Row Pct.	16.4	59.3	25.3	88.6
	Col. Pct.	87.2	88.6	89.6	
	Tot. Pct.	14.5	51.7	22.4	
Disruptive	Count	23	72	28	123
	Row Pct.	18.7	58.5	22.8	11.4
	Col. Pct.	12.8	11.4	10.4	
	Tot. Pct.	2.1	6.7	2.6	
Total Column		180	630	270	1080
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the size of the school. The obtained chi square of 0.623 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.7325. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{24}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 27

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	67	224	99	390
	Row Pct.	17.2	57.4	25.4	79.3
	Col. Pct.	79.8	78.9	79.8	
	Tot. Pct.	13.6	45.5	20.1	
Disruptive	Count	17	60	25	102
	Row Pct.	16.7	58.8	24.5	20.7
	Col. Pct.	20.2	21.1	20.2	
	Tot. Pct.	3.5	12.2	5.1	
Total Column		84	284	124	492
Total Col. Pct.		17.1	57.7	25.2	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic status in schools of

different sizes. The obtained chi square of 0.0064 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.9685. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{25}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 28

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MIDDLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	65	268	115	448
	Row Pct.	14.5	59.8	25.7	95.7
	Col. Pct.	91.5	96.1	97.5	
	Tot. Pct.	13.9	57.3	24.6	
Disruptive	Count	6	11	3	20
	Row Pct.	30.0	55.0	15.0	4.3
	Col. Pct.	8.5	3.9	2.5	
	Tot. Pct.	1.3	2.4	0.6	
Total Column		71	279	118	468
Total Column Pct.		15.2	59.6	25.2	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 3.967 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.1376. Hence,

the null hypothesis is not rejected. The small size schools with 15.2% of the sample's students in middle socio-economic position, identified 30% of the disruptive students in this group. Because the expected value of each cell was not 5 or above, a z test was made. The obtained value between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive small and large school students was 1.876. The obtained z between the proportions of small and medium school students was 1.61. Both failed to be significant at the .05 level.

H_{26}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 29

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	25	66	28	119
	Row Pct.	21.0	55.5	23.5	99.2
	Col. Pct.	100.0	98.5	0.0	
	Tot. Pct.	20.8	55.0	23.3	
Disruptive	Count	0	1	0	1
	Row Pct.	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.8
	Col. Pct.	0.0	1.5	0.0	
	Tot. Pct.	0.0	0.8	0.0	
Total Column		25	67	28	120
Total Column Pct.		20.8	55.8	23.3	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 0.798 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.6711. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. A z test was made because the expected value of the disruptive students' cells was less than 5, with the following results:

Medium and large schools - z = 0.653

Medium and small schools - z = 0.617

None of these values is significant.

H_{27}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 30

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE BLACK STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	52	174	75	301
	Row Pct.	17.3	57.8	24.9	83.6
	Col. Pct.	86.7	82.9	83.3	
	Tot. Pct.	14.4	48.3	20.8	
Disruptive	Count	8	36	15	59
	Row Pct.	13.6	61.0	25.4	16.4
	Col. Pct.	13.3	17.1	16.7	
	Tot. Pct.	2.2	10.0	4.2	
Total Column		60	210	90	360
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 0.501 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.7784. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{28}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 31

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE WHITE AMERICAN STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	51	191	88	330
	Row Pct.	15.5	57.9	26.7	91.7
	Col. Pct.	85.0	91.0	97.8	
	Tot. Pct.	14.2	53.1	24.4	
Disruptive	Count	9	19	2	30
	Row Pct.	30.0	63.3	6.7	8.3
	Col. Pct.	15.0	9.0	2.2	
	Tot. Pct.	2.5	5.3	0.6	
Total Column		60	210	90	360
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive white

American students in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 8.031 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.018. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in small and large schools obtained a z value of 2.95 which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. The z value obtained of 2.12 in medium and large schools is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

H_{29}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 32

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE HISPANIC-ORIGIN STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	54	193	79	326
	Row Pct.	16.6	59.2	24.2	90.6
	Col. Pct.	90.0	91.9	87.8	
	Tot. Pct.	15.0	53.6	21.9	
Disruptive	Count	6	17	11	34
	Row Pct.	17.6	50.0	32.4	9.4
	Col. Pct.	10.0	8.1	12.2	
	Tot. Pct.	1.7	4.7	3.1	
Total Column		60	210	90	360
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 1.281 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.5271. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{30}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 33

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MALE STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	69	265	119	453
	Row Pct.	15.2	58.5	26.3	83.9
	Col. Pct.	76.7	84.1	88.1	
	Tot. Pct.	12.8	49.1	22.0	
Disruptive	Count	21	50	16	87
	Row Pct.	24.1	57.5	18.4	16.1
	Col. Pct.	23.3	15.9	11.9	
	Tot. Pct.	3.9	9.3	3.0	
Total Column		90	315	135	540
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive male

students in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 5.299 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.0707. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The large size schools with 25% of the male students, identified 18.4% as disruptive, while the small size schools with 16.7% of the students in this group identified 24.1%.

H_{31}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools of different sizes.

TABLE 34

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE FEMALE STUDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		Small	Medium	Large	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	88	293	123	504
	Row Pct.	17.5	58.1	24.4	93.3
	Col. Pct.	97.8	93.0	91.1	
	Tot. Pct.	16.3	54.3	22.8	
Disruptive	Count	2	22	12	36
	Row Pct.	5.6	61.1	33.3	6.7
	Col. Pct.	2.2	7.0	8.9	
	Tot. Pct.	0.4	4.1	2.2	
Total Column		90	315	135	540
Total Column Pct.		16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive female

students in schools of different sizes. The obtained chi square of 3.98 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.1367. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The large size schools with 25% of the female students identified 33.3% as disruptive. The small size schools with 16.7% of the students in this group reported 5.6% as disruptive.

Section V

Hypothesis 32 tests the incidence of disruptive behavior in urban and suburban schools. The rest of the hypotheses in this section test the relationship between this school variable and each of the student variables.

> H_{32}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in urban and suburban schools.

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the location of the school. The obtained chi square of 0.0367 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.8481. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

> H_{33}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 35

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS IN URBAN AND SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	480	477	957
	Row Pct.	50.2	49.8	88.6
	Col. Pct.	88.9	88.3	
	Tot. Pct.	44.4	44.2	
Disruptive	Count	60	63	123
	Row Pct.	48.8	51.2	11.4
	Col. Pct.	11.1	11.7	
	Tot. Pct.	5.6	5.8	
Total Column		540	540	1080
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

TABLE 36

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	224	166	390
	Row Pct.	57.4	42.6	79.3
	Col. Pct.	81.5	76.5	
	Tot. Pct.	45.5	33.7	
Disruptive	Count	51	51	102
	Row Pct.	50.0	50.0	20.7
	Col. Pct.	18.5	23.5	
	Tot. Pct.	10.4	10.4	
Total Column		275	217	492
Total Column Pct.		55.9	44.1	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive lower socio-economic position students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 1.524 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.217. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The suburban schools reported 23.5% of the sample as disruptive in contrast with 18.5% in the urban schools.

H_{34}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 37

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MIDDLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	192	256	448
	Row Pct.	42.9	57.1	95.7
	Col. Pct.	95.5	95.9	
	Tot. Pct.	41.0	54.7	
Disruptive	Count	9	11	20
	Row Pct.	45.0	55.0	4.3
	Col. Pct.	4.5	4.1	
	Tot. Pct.	1.9	2.4	
Total Column		201	267	468
Total Column Pct.		42.9	57.1	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive middle socio-economic position students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square was 0.0017 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of 0.9669. The null hypothesis, therefore, is not rejected.

H_{35}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 38

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC POSITION STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	64	55	119
	Row Pct.	53.8	46.2	99.2
	Col. Pct.	100.0	98.2	
	Tot. Pct.	53.3	45.8	
Disruptive	Count	0	1	1
	Row. Pct.	0.0	100.0	0.8
	Col. Pct.	0.0	1.8	
	Tot. Pct.	0.0	0.8	
Total Column		64	56	120
Total Column Pct.		53.3	46.7	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive upper

socio-economic position students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 0.0045 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.9465. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Because the expected value of each cell was not 5 or above, a z test was made. The obtained value of 1.082 is not statistically significant.

H_{36}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 39

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE BLACK AMERICAN STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	153	148	301
	Row Pct.	50.8	49.2	83.6
	Col. Pct.	85.0	82.2	
	Tot. Pct.	42.5	41.1	
Disruptive	Count	27	32	59
	Row Pct.	45.8	54.2	16.4
	Col. Pct.	15.0	17.8	
	Tot. Pct.	7.5	8.9	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive black

American students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 0.324 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.569. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{37}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 40

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE WHITE AMERICAN STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	166	164	330
	Row Pct.	50.3	49.7	91.7
	Col. Pct.	92.2	91.1	
	Tot. Pct.	46.1	45.6	
Disruptive	Count	14	16	30
	Row Pct.	46.7	53.3	8.3
	Col. Pct.	7.8	8.9	
	Tot. Pct.	3.9	4.4	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 0.0364 with 1 degree of freedom

had a probability of 0.8488. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{38}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 41

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE HISPANIC-ORIGIN STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	161	165	326
	Row Pct.	49.4	50.6	90.6
	Col. Pct.	89.4	91.7	
	Tot. Pct.	44.7	45.8	
	Count	19	15	34
	Row Pct.	55.9	44.1	9.4
	Col. Pct.	10.6	8.3	
	Tot. Pct.	5.3	4.2	
Total Column		180	180	360
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 0.292 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.5887. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

H_{39}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 42

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE MALE STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	221	232	453
	Row Pct.	48.8	51.2	83.9
	Col. Pct.	81.9	85.9	
	Tot. Pct.	40.9	43.0	
Disruptive	Count	49	38	87
	Row Pct.	56.3	43.7	16.1
	Col. Pct.	18.1	14.1	
	Tot. Pct.	9.1	7.0	
Total Column		270	270	540
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive male students in urban and suburb an schools. The obtained chi square of 1.37 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.2418. Hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Urban schools identified 49 male students as disruptive while suburban schools only identified 38.

H_{40}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in urban and suburban schools.

TABLE 43

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE FEMALE STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LOCATION

		Urban	Suburban	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	259	245	504
	Row Pct.	51.4	48.6	93.3
	Col. Pct.	95.9	90.7	
	Tot. Pct.	48.0	45.4	
Disruptive	Count	11	25	36
	Row Pct.	30.6	69.4	6.7
	Col. Pct.	4.1	9.3	
	Tot. Pct.	2.0	4.6	
Total Column		270	270	540
Total Column Pct.		50.0	50.0	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between disruptive and non-disruptive female students in urban and suburban schools. The obtained chi square of 5.0298 with 1 degree of freedom had a probability of 0.0249. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Only 11 female students were identified as disruptive in urban schools; in contrast, suburban schools reported 25.

Section VI

Hypothesis 41 tests the incidence of disruptive behavior in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades.

H_{41}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in different grades.

TABLE 44

DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS IN SEVENTH, EIGHTH, AND NINTH GRADES

		Seventh Grade	Eighth Grade	Ninth Grade	Row Total
Non-Disruptive	Count	238	372	340	950
	Row Pct.	25.1	39.2	35.8	88.5
	Col. Pct.	88.1	91.4	85.9	
	Tot. Pct.	22.2	34.7	31.7	
Disruptive	Count	32	35	56	123
	Row Pct.	26.0	28.5	45.5	11.5
	Col. Pct.	11.9	8.6	14.1	
	Tot. Pct.	3.0	3.3	5.2	
Total Column		270	407	396	1073
Total Column Pct.		25.2	37.9	36.9	100.0

Chi square was run to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the student's grade. The obtained chi square of 6.128 with 2 degrees of freedom had a probability of 0.0467. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The

proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive ninth and seventh grade students obtained a z value of 0.824; a z value of 1.41 was obtained for seventh and eight grade students. There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between the proportions of ninth and eighth grade students with a z value of 2.47.

TABLE 45

COMPARISON OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE EIGHTH GRADERS AND SEVENTH AND NINTH GRADERS COMBINED

	Eighth Grade	Seventh & Ninth Grades	
Non-Disruptive	372	578	
Col. Pct.	91.4	86.8	
Disruptive	35	88	
Col. Pct.	8.6	13.2	
Total	407	666	1073

The proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive eighth grade students and the proportions of seventh and ninth grade students combined (See Table 45) obtained a z value of 2.3 which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Seven questionnaires did not have grade information.

Summary

In this chapter the results of the statistical analysis of all the hypotheses formulated in this study have been reviewed.

In Section I where the relationship of all the independent variables and the frequency of disruptive students were tested by multiple regression statistical technique in order to determine predictability, the null hypothesis was not rejected. However, an analysis of variance was made obtaining statistically significant fs at the 0.01 level for lower socio-economic status, male sex, Hispanic ethnic origin and eighth grade placement.

In Section II, where the relationship between disruptive behavior and the ethnicity, the socio-economic status and the sex of the students were tested, statistically significant differences were found in hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, and 13. The incidence of disruptive behavior in schools with principals of different ethnic origins and the relationships between this school variable and each of the student variables were tested in Section III. Statistically significant differences were found in hypotheses 15, 18, and 19. In Section IV, the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools of different sizes was tested. This section

also tested the relationships between this school variable and each of the student variables. A statistically significant difference was found in hypothesis 28. The incidence of disruptive behavior in urban and suburban schools and the relationships between this school variable and each of the student variables were tested in Section V. A statistically significant difference was found in hypothesis 40. Hypothesis 41, the only one tested in Section VI, found a statistically significant difference in the incidence of disruptive behavior of seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students. The summary, discussion, and conclusions of this study are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the socio-economic status, the ethnicity, and the sex of the student, the location and the size of the school, and the incidence of disruptive behavior at the junior high school level. A secondary purpose was to discover whether there is a relationship between the ethnicity of the school principal and the kinds of students who exhibit disruptive behavior.

Forty-one null hypotheses were tested:

H_1, There is no significant difference between the socio-economic position, the ethnicity, the grade, and the sex of the student; the location, the size, and the ethnic origin of the principal of the school and the frequency of disruptive students.

H_2, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different socio-economic positions.

H_3, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different ethnic origins.

H_4, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of different sexes.

H_5, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_6, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_7, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position and different ethnic origins.

H_8, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportion of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of lower socio-economic position.

H_9, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of middle socio-economic position.

H_{10}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students, male and female, of upper socio-economic position.

H_{11}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students of different sexes.

H_{12}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students of different sexes.

H_{13}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students of different sexes.

H_{14}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{15}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{16}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{17}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{18}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{19}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{20}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{21}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{22}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins.

H_{23}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in schools of different sizes.

H_{24}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{25}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{26}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in schools of different sizes.

H_{27}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in schools of different sizes.

H_{28}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in schools of different sizes.

H_{29}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in schools of different sizes.

H_{30}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in schools of different sizes.

H_{31}, There is no significant difference between the expected and the observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in schools of different sizes.

H_{32}, There is no significiant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{33}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{34}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of middle socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{35}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students of upper socio-economic position in urban and suburban schools.

H_{36}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{37}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive white American students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{38}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive Hispanic-origin students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{39}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{40}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in urban and suburban schools.

H_{41}, There is no significant difference between the expected and observed proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive students in different grades.

The stratified random sample for this study was drawn from 12 junior high schools in Dade County with a student population of 14,281. A sample of 90 students was selected from each school. It contained equal numbers of males and females of each of the 3 ethnic groups. The school system had 46 junior high schools with an enrollment of 61,569. Of the 12 junior high schools selected for this study, 6 were located in the urban area of the

county and the rest in the suburban area. Half of the schools had white American principals and the other half had principals of different ethnic origins. Two of the schools were of small size, 7 of medium size, and 3 of large size.

A questionnaire was used to gather the data for this study. During the Spring of 1978, the students completed the questionnaire under the supervision of a guidance counselor. The assistant principal in charge of discipline reviewed them once they had been completed in order to ascertain that the information of whether the student had been disruptive during the school year was accurate. Of the 1080 students selected for this study, 123 were identified as disruptive. The Two Factor Index of Social Position (Hollingshead, 1957) was used in order to determine the socio-economic status of each student.

A forward (stepwise) inclusion approach of multiple linear regression was used in testing the first hypothesis to determine whether all the independent variables (the student's socio-economic status, ethnicity, grade placement, and sex; the location, size, and ethnic origin of the principal of the school), were collectively predictors of disruptive behavior. The values obtained in the regression analysis were not statistically significant. Hence the null hypothesis was not rejected. However, the results of the analysis of variance in each step of the multiple regression

showed lower socio-economic status, male sex, Hispanic origin and eighth grade with f values significant at the 0.01 level.

Chi square was used to test the rest of the hypotheses in this study for statistical significance.

In testing the second null hypothesis to determine the relationship between disruptive behavior and students' socio-economic status, a chi square of 79.28, significant at the 0.01 level, was obtained. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. A z test was run to determine which of the proportions of the socio-economic status (lower, middle, upper) was statistically significant. Lower socio-economic status resulted significant at the 0.01 level.

In testing the third null hypothesis to determine the relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the ethnicity of the student, a chi square of 13.59, significant at the 0.01 level was obtained. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. A significant z value at the 0.01 resulted when the proportions of black American students and the proportions of white American and Hispanic-origin students were compared.

In testing the fourth null hypothesis for statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior and the sex of the student, a significant chi square value of 22.94 was obtained, with male students being more

disruptive. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh null hypotheses tested the statistical relationships between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive lower, middle, and upper socio-economic status students, respectively, and their ethnic origin. A significant chi square value of 8.97 was obtained among the proportions of lower socio-economic status black American, white American, and Hispanic-origin students. A significant z value resulted between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive lower socio-economic status Hispanic-origin students and their black American and white American counterparts. Hence the fifth null hypothesis was rejected. No statistically significant differences were obtained between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive middle and upper socio-economic status students of different ethnic origins. Therefore, the sixth and seventh null hypotheses were not rejected.

The eighth, ninth, and tenth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male and female students of different socio-economic status. A significant chi square value of 19.1 was obtained between the proportions of male and female students of lower socio-economic status, males being more disruptive. Therefore, the eighth null hypothesis was rejected. No statistically significant differences

were obtained between the proportions of male and female students of middle and upper socio-economic status. Hence, the ninth and tenth null hypotheses were not rejected.

The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male and female students of different ethnic origins. A significant chi square value of 13.7 was obtained between the proportions of male and female black American students, with males being more disruptive. Therefore, the eleventh null hypothesis was rejected. No statistically significant difference was obtained between the proportions of male and female white American students. Hence, the twelfth null hypothesis was not rejected. A significant chi square value of 5.49 was obtained between the proportions of male and female Hispanic-origin students with males being more disruptive. Therefore the thirteenth null hypothesis was rejected.

In testing the fourteenth null hypothesis to determine any statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools with principals of different ethnic origins, a non-significant chi square value of 0.147 was obtained. Hence, the fourteenth null hypothesis was not rejected.

The fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive lower, middle, and upper socio-economic status students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. A significant chi square value of 4.195 was obtained between the proportions of lower socio-economic students, the schools with white American principals identifying more disruptive students. Therefore, the fifteenth null hypothesis was rejected. Non-significant chi square values were obtained in testing the proportions of middle and upper socio-economic status students. Hence, the sixteenth and seventeenth null hypotheses were not rejected.

The eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American, white American and Hispanic-origin students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. A significant chi square value of 3.97 was obtained between the proportions of black American students, the schools with white American principals identifying more disruptive students. Therefore the eighteenth null hypothesis was rejected. A significant chi square value of 8.18 was obtained between the proportions of white American students, the schools with non-white American principals identifying more disruptive students in this ethnic group. Hence, the nineteenth null hypothesis was rejected. No significant differences were

obtained between the proportions of Hispanic-origin students. Therefore, the twentieth null hypothesis was not rejected.

The twenty-first and twenty-second null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male and female students, respectively, in schools with principals of different ethnic origins. The chi square values obtained were not significant. Hence, the twenty-first and twenty-second null hypotheses were not rejected.

In testing the twenty-third null hypothesis to determine the statistical relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior in schools of different sizes, a non-significant chi square value of 0.623 was obtained. Therefore, the twenty-third null hypothesis was not rejected.

The twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive lower, middle, and upper socio-economic-status students, respectively, in schools of different sizes. Non-significant chi square values were obtained. Hence, the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth null hypotheses were not rejected.

The twenty-seventh, twenty-eighth, and twenty-ninth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American, white American and Hispanic-origin students,

respectively, in schools of different sizes. A non-significant chi square value of 0.501 was obtained between the proportions of black American students. Therefore, the twenty-seventh null hypothesis was not rejected. A significant chi square value of 8.031 was obtained between the proportions of white American students, with large schools identifying fewer disruptive students. Hence, the twenty-eighth null hypothesis was rejected. A non-significant chi square value of 1.281 was obtained between the proportions of Hispanic-origin students. Therefore, the twenty-ninth null hypothesis was not rejected.

The thirtieth and thirty-first null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male and female students in schools of different sizes. Non-significant chi square values were obtained. Hence, the thirtieth and thirty-first null hypotheses were not rejected.

In testing the thirty-second null hypothesis to determine the relationship between the incidence of disruptive behavior in urban and suburban schools, a non-significant chi square value of 0.0367 was obtained. Therefore, the thirty-second null hypothesis was not rejected.

In testing the thirty-third, thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth null hypotheses to determine the relationship

between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive lower, middle, and upper socio-economic status students respectively in urban and suburban schools, non-significant chi square values were obtained. Hence, the thirty-third, thirty-fourth, and thirty-fifth null hypotheses were not rejected.

In testing the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, and thirty-eighth null hypotheses to determine the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive black American, white American, and Hispanic-origin students, respectively, in urban and suburban schools, non-significant chi square values were obtained. Therefore, the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, and thirty-eighth null hypotheses were not rejected.

The thirty-ninth and fortieth null hypotheses tested the relationship between the proportions of disruptive and non-disruptive male and female students in urban and suburban schools. A non-significant chi square value of 1.37 was obtained between the proportions of male students. Hence, the thirty-ninth null hypothesis was not rejected. However, a significant chi square value of 5.0298 was obtained between the proportions of female students, with suburban schools reporting a higher incidence of disruptive female students. Therefore, the fortieth null hypothesis was rejected.

In testing the forty-first null hypothesis to determine the incidence of disruptive behavior in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grade a significant chi square value of 6.128 was obtained, with the eighth grade reporting the lowest incidence of disruptive behavior. Hence, the forty-first null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 46

REJECTED NULL HYPOTHESES IN ORDER OF SIGNIFICANCE

Hypothesis Number	Chi Square Values	df	Significance
2	79.28	2	0.0000
4	22.94	1	0.0000
8	19.10	1	0.0000
11	13.70	1	0.0002
3	13.60	2	0.0011
19	8.18	1	0.0042
5	8.97	2	0.0113
28	8.03	2	0.0180
13	5.49	1	0.0191
40	5.03	1	0.0349
15	4.19	1	0.0406
18	3.97	1	0.0462
41	6.13	2	0.0467

The interpretation of the results of this study will be discussed in the following section of this chapter.

Discussion

The basic premise underlying this study was that a student's behavior in the school is a reflection of certain student characteristics beyond the school's control. Furthermore, certain school characteristics are related to the students' behavior. The socio-economic status, ethnicity, and sex of the student and the location, size, and ethnicity of the principal of the school were the independent variables used in this study. Another premise motivating this study was that the ethnicity of the student is incidental to his/her school behavior. Rather other student variables such as his/her socio-economic status (poverty and social deprivation) and sex, are related to the behavior of the student. Bias caused by a negative opinion held by some people about ethnic minorities has resulted in the alienation of this type of student. Moreover, studies conducted in the last decade have reported unequal treatment of students by teachers, based on the student's ethnic origin and socio-economic status. Some of these studies include Jackson and Lahaderne (1967), Yee (1968), Brophy and Good (1970), and Rist (1970). Some of the results of this study supported these premises.

It should be remembered at this point that this study did not include the less serious types of misbehavior that result in a teacher's referral and end with a reprimand

at the assistant principal's office. This study was only concerned with the more severe types of disruptive behavior which warrant the removal of the student from the school environment.

In testing the first null hypothesis, stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the difference between the socio-economic position, the ethnicity, the grade, and the sex of the student; the location, the size, and the ethnic origin of the principal of the school, and the frequency of disruptive behavior. The best predictors obtained in the regression analysis were (1) socio-economic position--lower; (2) sex--male; (3) ethnicity--non-Hispanic, (4) grade--non-eighth grader. Although these variables accounted for only 10.5% of the variance, the f value of each of the variables obtained in the regression analysis were statistically significant at the 0.01 level, with lower socio-economic status being the strongest predictor followed in order of importance by male sex, non-Hispanic, and non-eighth grader. This indicates that the student more prone to be suspended is of lower socio-economic status, male, non-Hispanic origin in the seventh or ninth grade. However, the importance of the non-Hispanic-origin variable should be reassessed due to the fact that most Hispanic-origin students were Cubans whose parents came from middle or upper socio-economic-status homes in

Cuba, and although in the lower socio-economic status at the time of this study, maintained their middle or upper class values. Since the first null hypothesis encompassed all the independent variables, it was not rejected.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the rest of the null hypotheses. In testing the second hypothesis socio-economic status--lower was found to have the highest significant relationship with the incidence of disruptive behavior. This added support to the findings in the first null hypothesis and corroborated the results of studies conducted by Hollingshead (1949); Pearl, (1965); Hindelang (1971), and Lufler (1978).

In testing the third null hypothesis, ethnicity was found to have a highly significant relationship with the incidence of disruptive behavior, with black American students being the most disruptive. However, when socio-economic status is controlled, ethnicity was found to be incidental to disruptive behavior. This will be reviewed when the findings of the fifth, sixth, and seventh null hypotheses are discussed.

In testing the fourth null hypothesis to determine the relationship between students of different sex and the incidence of disruptive behavior, a significant chi square value of 22.94 significant at less than 0.0001 level was obtained. Male students were found to be more

disruptive than their female counterparts. This finding added support to the conclusions of Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Poorman et al. (1976), and Howard (1978).

In testing the fifth, sixth, and seventh null hypotheses that compared the differences between the disruptive and non-disruptive students of lower-, middle- and upper-socio-economic status; respectively, and different ethnic origin, only the fifth null hypothesis obtained a significant chi square of 8.97. Hispanic-origin students were significantly less disruptive than their black- and white-American counterparts. However, in the discussion of the first null hypothesis it was explained why this finding should be reassessed. No significant differences were found in the sixth and seventh null hypotheses. These findings indicate that there is no relationship between ethnicity and disruptive behavior once that socio-economic status is taken into consideration. This finding added support to studies conducted by Williams and Gold (1972) and Walberg et al. (1974).

In testing the eighth, ninth, and tenth null hypotheses that compared the difference between disruptive and nondisruptive male and female students of lower-, middle-, and upper-socio-economic status, respectively, the eighth null hypothesis obtained a significant chi square value. The ninth and tenth null hypotheses obtained nonsignificant values. This indicates that lower-socio-

economic male students are more disruptive than their female counterparts.

In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth null hypotheses, black American and Hispanic-origin males were found to be more disruptive than their female counterparts. No significant difference was found in the incidence of disruptive behavior of male and female white American students.

Of the rest of the null hypotheses, only six were found to be significant. In testing the fifteenth null hypothesis, a significant chi square value of 4.195 was obtained. This indicates that white American school principals identified a larger proportion of lower-socio-economic status students than their counterparts.

In testing the eighteenth null hypothesis to determine the relationship between disruptive and nondisruptive black American students in schools with principals of different ethnic origins, a significant chi square value of 3.97 was obtained. White American principals identified a greater proportion of disruptive black American students than the non-white American principals. In testing the nineteenth null hypothesis to determine the relationship between disruptive and nondisruptive white American students in schools with non-white American principals, a significant chi square

value of 8.18 was obtained. This indicated that non-white American principals identified a greater proportion of disruptive white American students than their counterparts. However, this finding is misleading. A chi square was run to determine any statistically significant difference between the number of black American, white American, and Hispanic-origin students identified as disruptive by principals of different ethnic origins (see Table 47).

TABLE 47

BLACK AMERICAN, WHITE AMERICAN, AND HISPANIC-ORIGIN STUDENTS IDENTIFIED AS DISRUPTIVE IN SCHOOLS WITH PRINCIPALS OF DIFFERENT ETHNIC ORIGINS

		White American	Other	Row Total
Black	Count	37	22	59
	Row Pct.	62.7	37.3	48.0
	Col. Pct.	57.8	37.3	
	Tot. Pct.	30.1	17.9	
Hispanic	Count	20	14	34
	Row Pct.	58.8	41.2	27.6
	Col. Pct.	31.3	23.7	
	Tot. Pct.	16.3	11.4	
White	Count	7	23	30
	Row Pct.	23.3	76.7	24.4
	Col. Pct.	10.9	39.0	
	Tot. Pct.	5.7	18.7	
Total Column		64	59	123
Total Column Pct.		52.0	48.0	100.0

The obtained chi square of 13.224 was significant at less than 0.01 level. Although the total number of disruptive students identified by white American and non-white American

principals was very similar, the proportions of disruptive black American, white American, and Hispanic-origin students were not. Of the 64 students identified as disruptive by white-American principals, 57.8% were black American students, 31.3% were Hispanic-origin students, and only 10.9% were white American students. In contrast, of the 59 students identified as disruptive by non-white American princpals, 37.3% were black American students, 23.7% Hispanic-origin students, and 39% white American students. This finding adds support to the work of Shuttlesworth and Evans (1974) and Love (1977).

In testing the twenty-eighth null hypothesis to determine any difference between the proportions of disruptive white American students in schools of different sizes, a significant chi square value of 8.03 was obtained. A smaller proportion of disruptive white American students was identified in large schools. This finding is in contradiction with studies conducted by Baron (1975), the National Institute of Education (1977), and Kelly (1978). Therefore, it should be considered with great reservation.

In testing the fortieth null hypothesis to determine any difference between the proportion of disruptive and non-disruptive female students in urban and suburban schools, a significant chi square of 5.03 was obtained. A greater proportion of disruptive female students was identified in suburban schools. This finding, together

with the rest of the findings of the hypotheses in Section V of Chapter IV are contrary to the findings of studies conducted by Cloward and Ohlin (1960), the Teacher Opinion Poll (1974), Koch (1975), and the National Institute of Education (1977). Hence, they should be considered with great reservation.

In testing the forty-first null hypothesis to determine any difference in the incidence of disruptive behavior in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grade, a significant chi square value of 6.13 was obtained. The eighth grade had the smallest proportion of disruptive students.

Conclusions

Ten conclusions were drawn from this study.

1. The proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic-status students is significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive middle- and upper-class students. Furthermore, this variable has the highest relationship with the incidence of disruptive behavior.

2. The proportion of disruptive male students is significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive female students.

3. The ethnicity of the student is incidental to the incidence of disruptive behavior when socio-economic status is taken into consideration.

4. The proportion of disruptive lower-socio economic male students is significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive middle- and upper-socio-economic-status male students.

5. The proportions of disruptive black American and Hispanic-origin male students are significantly higher than the proportions of disruptive black American and Hispanic-origin female students.

6. The proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic-status students in schools with white-American principals is significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive lower-socio-economic status students in schools with non-white American principals.

7. The proportion of disruptive black American students in schools with white American principals is significantly higher than the proportion of disruptive black American students in schools with non-white American principals.

8. There is no significant difference in the proportions of disruptive students of different ethnic origins in schools with non-white American principals.

9. Schools with white American principals identify as disruptive a significantly higher proportion of black American students and a significantly lower proportion of white American students than schools with non-white American principals.

10. The proportion of disruptive students in the eighth grade is significantly lower than the proportions of disruptive students in the seventh and the ninth grade.

These conclusions connote the following implications:

1. Lower-socio-economic status is the most powerful predictor of disruptive behavior with male sex being the second.

2. Although demographic variables cannot be changed, the placement of teachers who understand underprivileged students and their psychological and social deficits in schools with a high lower-socio-economic-status school population should reduce the incidence of disruptive behavior, as proposed by Hendrix (1970).

3. Teachers whose strategies have been successful in dealing with disruptive behavior in lower-socio-economic areas should conduct workshops for teachers who work with lower-socio-economic-status students.

4. Efforts should be made to ascertain that bias and prejudice do not exist in the schools.

5. Since lower-socio-economic status is beyond the control of the school and it predetermines poor students' academic failures, as indicated in many studies, i.e., Coleman et al. (1966), Jencks (1972), and "Toward Equal Educational Opportunity" (1972), as well as their behavior in the school, i.e., Cloward & Ohlin (1960), Erickson

(1973), Howard (1978), the school alone should not be held accountable. Rather, all the institutions of society that have a vested interest in the education of our youth should share this responsibility.

Questions unanswered in this study which may warrant future research are:

1. Does academic achievement influence the behavior of the student?

2. To what extent does teacher competency determine the incidence of disruptive behavior in the classroom?

3. To what extent does the competency of the assistant principal for administration of discipline determine the incidence of disruptive behavior in the schools?

4. Why do schools with white American principals identify higher proportions of black American and lower-socio-economic-status students?

5. All the research indicates that small size, as well as suburban schools are associated with a low incidence of disruptive behavior. This study did not yield the same results. In future research, it may be appropriate to duplicate the study of disruptive behavior in schools of different sizes in urban and suburban areas.

APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT'S NAME: _____

_____

(1) GRADE: _____ (2) SEX: MALE _____

FEMALE _____

(3) ETHNICITY:

BLACK AMERICAN _____

HISPANIC _____

WHITE AMERICAN _____

OTHER _____

(4) OCCUPATION OF THE STUDENT'S FATHER _____

(5) OCCUPATION OF THE STUDENT'S MOTHER _____

(6) LEVEL OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED BY STUDENT'S FATHER _____

(7) LEVEL OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED BY STUDENT'S MOTHER _____

(8) WAS THE STUDENT SUSPENDED THIS SCHOOL YEAR? YES _____

NO _____

(9) ETHNICITY OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: WHITE AMERICAN _____

OTHER _____

(10) NAME OF THE SCHOOL _____

PLEASE DETACH STUDENT'S NAME AND RETURN TO:

ARMANDO R. GARRIDO

1505 S.W. Second Court

Miami, Florida 33129

ECONOMIC SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN DADE COUNTY

SCHOOL	% OF STUDENTS DETERMINED ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
Allapattah	84.87
Arvida	13.38
Brownsville	70.83
Campbell Dr.	75.74
Carol City	59.67
Carver, G.W.	32.00
Centennial	25.89
Citrus Grove	69.30
Cutler Ridge	28.30
Filer, H.H.	48.00
Fisher, I.M.	71.53
Glades	5.42
Hialeah	38.69
Homestead	56.96
Jefferson, T.	31.01
Kennedy, J.F.	18.15
Kinlock Park	5.68
Lake Stevens	63.58
Lee, R.E.	79.68
Madison	63.72
Mann, H.	53.86
Mays	52.48
McMillan, H.	9.39
Merritt, A.	43.02
Miami Edison	69.14
Miami Lakes	18.12
Miami Springs	48.37
Nautilus	20.93
Norland	26.55
North Dade	72.47
North Miami	22.55
Palm Springs	9.63
Palmetto	1.56
Parkway	44.47
Ponce de Leon	23.33
Redland	33.64
Richmond Hts.	34.04
Riviera	24.59
Rockway	2.76
Shenandoah	32.58
South Miami	27.92
Southwood	12.46
Thomas, W.R.	23.74
Washington	65.09
West Miami	4.98
Westview	57.40

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS BY ETHNIC CLASSIFICATION BY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN DADE COUNTY

	WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHERS	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
Allapattah	27	2.61	559	54.21	444	43.06	1	0.09
Arvida	1014	71.91	284	20.14	96	6.80	16	1.13
Brownsville	180	16.77	493	45.94	400	37.27	0	0.0
Campbell Dr.	534	37.71	389	27.47	490	34.60	3	0.21
Carol City	219	15.46	600	42.37	597	42.16	0	0.0
Carver, G.W.	258	45.58	182	32.15	125	22.08	1	0.17
Centennial	913	72.57	252	20.03	81	6.43	12	0.94
Citrus Grove	38	3.38	288	25.66	790	70.40	6	0.52
Cutler Ridge	824	66.99	313	25.44	87	7.01	6	0.48
Filer, H.H.	93	6.73	279	20.20	1009	73.06	0	0.0
Fisher, I.M.	114	15.78	287	39.75	320	44.32	1	0.13
Glades	973	78.53	9	0.72	233	18.80	24	1.93
Hialeah	448	25.38	215	12.18	1100	63.32	2	0.10
Homestead	630	52.50	364	30.33	203	16.91	3	0.25
Jefferson, T.	586	59.31	271	27.42	127	12.85	4	0.40
Kennedy, J.F.	1304	89.80	52	3.58	87	5.99	9	0.61
Kinlock Park	188	8.32	11	0.48	2043	90.51	15	0.66
Lake Stevens	345	23.61	711	48.66	404	27.65	1	0.06
Lee, R.E.	22	2.55	412	47.79	427	49.53	1	0.11
Madison	206	15.67	853	64.91	254	19.33	1	0.07
Mann, H.	323	29.23	569	51.49	205	18.55	8	0.72
Mays	475	32.37	580	39.53	412	28.08	0	0.0
McMillan, H.	748	67.50	10	0.90	323	29.15	27	2.43
Merritt, A.	29	2.94	267	27.10	688	69.84	1	0.10
Miami Edison	75	5.04	1205	80.98	208	13.97	0	0.0
Miami Lakes	1331	73.90	9	0.49	457	25.37	4	0.21
Miami Springs	314	23.66	671	50.56	342	25.77	0	0.0
Nautilus	765	61.84	265	21.42	207	16.73	0	0.0
Norland	1032	73.13	269	10.06	94	6.66	16	1.12
North Dade	99	9.50	895	85.89	48	4.60	0	0.0

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS BY ETHNIC CLASSIFICATION BY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN DADE COUNTY

	WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHERS	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
North Miami	988	72.75	220	16.20	136	10.01	14	1.02
Palm Springs	628	30.44	11	0.53	1418	68.73	6	0.28
Palmetto	1320	92.76	24	1.68	71	4.98	8	0.56
Parkway	510	37.36	544	39.85	308	22.56	3	0.21
Ponce de Leon	632	46.33	332	24.34	387	28.37	12	0.95
Redland	524	68.85	155	20.36	78	10.24	4	0.52
Richmond Hts.	609	46.13	494	37.42	217	16.43	0	0.0
Riviera	879	61.98	8	0.56	528	37.23	3	0.21
Rockway	629	34.57	0	0.0	1180	64.87	10	0.54
Shenandoah	145	8.69	10	0.59	1510	90.58	2	0.11
South Miami	607	57.64	335	31.90	110	10.44	0	0.0
Southwood	868	70.41	169	15.46	42	3.84	14	1.27
Thomas, W.R.	695	49.57	27	1.92	671	47.86	9	0.63
Washington	40	4.50	290	32.69	557	62.79	0	0.0
West Miami	668	31.56	2	0.09	1441	68.10	5	0.23
Westview	350	31.22	488	43.53	271	24.17	12	1.08

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atchinson, C.O. A comparative study of the self-concept of behavior problem and non-behavior problem high school boys. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.

Balester, R.J. The self-concept and juvenile delinquency. Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

Baron, R.M. Crowding and the educational process. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan. 1975, 35(5), 318-320.

Bealer, J.E. An analysis of personality and demographic factors concerning students involved in disciplinary problems. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 38(12A), 4870-A.

Blake, E. Jr. A comparison of intraracial and interracial levels of aspiration. Dissertation Abstracts, 1960, 20(12), 4586.

Block, H.A. and Flynn, F. Delinquency. New York: Random House, 1956.

Bloom, W. Attitudes of mentally retarded students identified by educational level, ethnic group, sex, and socio-economic class. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25(09), 5103.

Blurton-Jones, N.G. (Ed.) Ethnological studies of child behaviour. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Bosch, G. Infantile autism: A clinical and phenomenological-anthropological investigation taking language as the guide. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1970.

Branch, C. An investigation of inferred and professed self-concept-as-learner of disruptive and non-disruptive middle school students. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974.

Braun, S.J. and Lasher, M.G. Preparing teachers to work with disturbed preschoolers. Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1970.

Brookover, W.B., Erickson, W.L., and Joiner, L.M. Self-concept of ability and school achievement III: Relationship of self-concept to achievement in high school. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1967.

Brookover, W.B., Patterson, A., and Thomas, S. Self-concept of ability and school achievement II: Improving academic achievement through students' self-concept enhancement. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1636. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1965.

Brookover, W.B., Thomas, S., and Patterson, A. Self-concept of ability and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 271-278.

Brophy, J.E. and Good, T.L. Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

Burrows, R. The effect of level of teacher approval on student disruptive behavior and self-concept. Dissertation Abstracts, 1971, 32(05-A), 2476-A.

Casstevens, M. Effects of modeling procedures in group counseling in the modification of disruptive school behavior with eighth grade students. Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 30(06-A), 2325.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Coleman, J.S. and others. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Conant, J.B. Slums and suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Cook, K.E. Differences between self-concepts of disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged high school students within certain types of urban and rural communities: Final report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1970.

Cummins, E.J., II. Selected affective and cognitive characteristics of student disciplinary offenders. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25(09), 5105.

Cunningham, L.L. Hey, man, you our principal: Urban education as I saw it. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1969, 51(3), 123-128.

Cutts, N.E. and Moseley, N. Teaching the disorderly pupil. New York: Longmans, 1957.

Davis, A.A. The relationship of school size to student morale. Dissertation Abstracts, 1972, 33(01A), 73-A.

Davis, A.A. and Havighurst, R.J. Social class and color differences in child-rearing. In C. Kluckholm and H.A. Murray (Eds.), Personality in nature, society, and culture. New York: Knopf Books, 1953.

DeBuzna, C.P. A study of school vandalism: Causes and prevention measures currently found in selected secondary schools in cities throughout Alabama. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alabama, 1974.

Driscoll, R.L. A survey of pupil disruptive behavior as viewed by student teachers. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 32(01-A), 281-A.

Duke, D.L. Who misbehaves?--A high school studies: Its discipline problems. Educational Administration Quarterly (Fall 1976), 12(3), 65-85.

Duke, D.L. How administrators view the crisis in school discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan. 1978, 59(5), 325-330.

Edwards, C. Modification of disruptive and non-academic behaviors of junior high school students in the natural setting: A token reinforcement program. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 29(08-A), 2560.

Erickson, K. and coworkers. Activism in the secondary schools: Analysis and recommendations. Research in Education. Eugene: Oregon University, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1969. (ED 027 618).

Erickson, M.L. Group violations, socioeconomic status and official delinquency. Social Forces, September 1973, 52(1), 41-52.

Erikson, E.H. Identify, youth and crisis. New York: W. Norton Co., 1965.

Experiences of teachers and students with disruptive behavior in the Dade public schools. Dade County Public Schools, 1976.

Feldhusen, J.F., Benning, J.J., and Thurston, J.E. Classroom behavior: Background factors and psychosocial correlates. Madison, Wisconsin: State Department of Public Welfare, 1964.

Feldhusen, J.F., Benning, J.J., and Thurston, J.E. Prediction of social adjustment over an eight-year period: Correlates and long-range implications of classroom aggression; prediction of academic achievement of children who display aggressive-disruptive classroom behavior. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University; Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Wisconsin State University, February 1971. (ED 047 334).

Feldhusen, J.F., Benning, J.J., and Thurston, J.E. Prediction of delinquency, adjustment and academic achievement over a 5-year period with the Kvaraceus delinquency proneness scale. Education Research, April 1972, 65, 375-381.

Fitts, W.H. and Hamner, W.T. The self concept and delinquency. Nashville Mental Health Center Monograph. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1969, 1.

Gallup. G.H. Ninth annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, Sept. 1977, 59(1), 33-47.

Glass, G.V. and Stanley, J.C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Gloeckler, T.L.B. and others. Project evaluation: The educational diagnostic and planning center. Cheyenne, Wyoming: Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center; Fort Collins, Colorado: Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, Inc., 1968.

Goldman, N.A. Sociopsychological study of school vandalism. Crime and Delinquency, 1961, 7(3), 221-230.

(The) Governor's Task Force on disruptive youth: Phase I report. Tallahassee: The Governor's Task Force, 1973.

Gurin, P. Social class constraints on the occupational aspirations of students attending some predominantly Negro colleges. Journal of Negro Education, 1966, 35, 336-368.

Hegstrom, W.O. and Hugh. L.L. Characteristics of disruptive high school students: Technical report no. 96. Madison, Wisconsin: Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, Wisconsin University, 1969. (ED 035 961).

Hendrix, H. A model program for selection and training of teacher candidates for service in inner-city schools. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 32(01A), 283-A.

Henning, C.J. Discipline: Are school practices changing? Clearing House, 1949, 23, 267-273.

Hewett, F., Artuso, A., Taylor, S., and Stillwell, R. The Santa Monica project: Demonstration and evaluation of an engineered classroom for emotionally disturbed children in public school: Phase 1--elementary level. Research in Education. Los Angeles: University of California, 1967. (ERIC Resume ED 031 026).

Higgins, P.S. The conflict resolution desegregation aides component of the Minneapolis schools 1973-74. Emergency School Aid Act Project: An evaluation. Minneapolis Public Schools, Minnesota Department of Research and Evaluation. Report No. C-73-64, December 1974.

Hindelang, M.J. Age, sex, and the versatility of delinquent involvements. Social Problems, Spring 1971, 18(4), 522-535.

Hollingshead, A.B. Elmtown's youth. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1949.

Hollingshead, A.B. Two-factor index of social position. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale Station, 1965 (c. 1957). (Mimeographed).

Howard, J.L. Factors in school vandalism. Journal of Research and Development in Education, Winter 1978, 11(2), 53-63.

Jackson, P.W. and Lahaderne, H.M. Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4, 204-211.

Jencks, C. Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Kaga, J. A conception of adolescence. National Elem. Principal, September 1971-April 1972, 41, 26-35.

Kelly, E.J. Our overcrowded secondary schools. The Educational Forum, January 1978, 42(2), 151-167.

Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Kingston, A.J. and Gentry, H.W. Discipline problems: Then and now. NAASP Bulletin, February 1977, 61(40), 94-99.

King-Stoops, J. and Meir, W. Teacher analysis of discipline problems. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan. 1978, 59(5), 354.

Koch, E.L. School vandalism and strategies of social control. Urban Education, April 1975, 10(1), 54-72.

Kounin, J.S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Lefeber, J.A. The delinquent's self-concept. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965.

Lively, E.L., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W.C. Self-concept as a predictor of juvenile delinquency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, 1, 159-168.

Love, B.J. Desegregation in your school: Behavior patterns that got in the way. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1977, 59(3), 168-170.

Lufler, H.S., Jr. Discipline: A new look at an old problem. Phi Delta Kappan, Feb. 1978, 59(6), 424-426.

McPartland, J.J. and McDill, E.L. Violence in schools. Fifth Annual Conference Council for Educational Development and Research, Washington, D.C., December 15 & 16, 1975, 10-11.

Mendell, E. Teachers', counselors', and deans' perceptions of disruptive student behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 29(7-A), 2069.

Miller, A.J. Learning disabilities and delinquent youth. Academic Therapy, Summer 1974, 9(6), 389-402.

Miller, W.B. Lower-class culture as a generation milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14(3), 5-19.

Morgan, H.W. The relationship between social background factors and parental attitudes on selected matters of discipline in the high schools of Washington County, Pennsylvania. Dissertation Abstracts, 1955, 15(05), 756.

Mussman, M.C. Prevention and reduction of emotional disorder in pupils: A theory and its immediate application to practices in the Columbus, Ohio, public schools. Columbis, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Division of Special Services, June 1968. (ED 031 014).

(The) National Institute of Education Executive Summary. Violent schools--safe schools. The Safe School Study Report to the Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, December 1977.

Neill, S.R. St. J. Aggressive and non-aggressive fighting in twelve-to-thirteen year old pre-adolescent boys. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1976, 17, 213-220.

Nelson, C.M. Techniques for screening conduct disturbed children. Exceptional Children, March 1971, 37, 501-507. (ED 034 993).

Nie, N.H., Haolai, H.G., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D.H. Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Niewiadomski, A.J. Student perceptions of secondary school discipline practices. Dissertation Abstracts, 1971, 32(04A), 1799-A.

Pearl, A. Youth in lower-class settings. In M. Sherif and C. Sherif (Eds.), Problems of youth. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Poorman, P., Donnerstein, E., and Donnerstein, M. Aggressive behavior as a function of age and sex. Journal of Genetic Psychology, June 1976, 128(2), 183-187.

Reckless, W.C. and Dinitz, S. The prevention of juvenile delinquency: An experiment. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1972.

Redl, F. Disruptive behavior in the classroom. School Review, August 1975, 569-593.

Reissman, L. Levels of aspiration and social class. American Sociological Review, 1953, 18, 233-242.

Rice, W.K., Jr. The Effects of Task-focused and Approval-focused Discipline Techniques. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975.

Rist, R.C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40(3), 411-451.

Ritterband, P. and Silberstein, R. Group disorders in the public schools. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 461-467.

Scarpitti, F.R., Murray, E., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W.C. The "good" boy in a high delinquency area: Four years later. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 555-558.

Schonfeld, W.A. Adolescent turmoil: Socioeconomic affluence as a factor. In R.E. Muuss (Ed.), Adolescent behavior and society. New York: Random House, 1968.

Scurry, A. The interrelationship among disruptive student behavior and student perceptions of alienation and internal-external control in black high school seniors. Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 37(06A), 3541-A.

Sexton, P. Education and income. New York: The Viking Press, 1961.

Shuttlesworth, J. and Evans, N. Why a principal must be a supervisor. School Management, May 1974, 18(5), 46, 50-64.

Smith, H.P. Racial and family experience correlates of mobility aspiration. Journal of Negro Education, 1962, 86, 67-74.

Starkey, C. An analysis of the components of a group contingency to control disruptive classroom behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1973, 34(10), 6489-A.

Szurek, S.A. and Berlin, I.N. Psychosomatic Disorders and Mental Retardation in Children. The Langley Porter Child Psychiatry Series, 168, 3.

Teacher Opinion Poll. National Education Association. Today's Education, Sept.-Oct., 1974, 63(3), 105.

Teachers Task Force. Inside out: Final report and recommendations on the improvement and reform of American education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Teitelbaum, H.S., Jr. A descriptive study of selected pupil disruptive behaviors. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 32(01A), 293-A.

Touliatos, J. and Lindholm, B. A canonical correlation analysis of demographic information and the behavior problem checklist. Psychology in the Schools, January 1976, 13(1), 15-18.

Toward Equal Educational Opportunity. The Report of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. United States Senate. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Trump, L.J. and Hunt, J. Report on a National Survey of Secondary School Principals on the Nature and Extent of Student Activism. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, San Francisco, March 1969.

Victor, J.V. A study of personality, attitudinal, and situational determinants of teacher behavior in regard to child misbehavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 32(01A), 293.

Walberg, H.J., Yeh, E.G., and Paton, S.M. Family background, ethnicity, and urban delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, January 1974, 11(1), 80-87.

Warner, W.L., Meeker, M., and Eells, K. Social class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.

Webster, C. Group therapy for behavior-problem children in rural junior high school. Child Welfare, December 1974, 53(10), 653-658.

West, E.H. Summary of research during 1965 related to Negroes and Negro education. Journal of Negro Education, 1966, 35, 62-72.

White, M.O. Alienation and self-esteem as they relate to race, sex, socioeconomic and school variables in urban high school age youth. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 32(02-A), 803.

Wilde, J.W. The effects of modeled punishment on disruptive junior high classroom behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 37(01B), 3557-A.

Williams, J. and Gold, M. From delinquent behavior to official delinquency. Social Problems, Fall 1972, 20(2), 209-229.

Willis, F. and Reeves, D. Touch interaction in junior high students in relation to sex and race. Developmental Psychology, January 1976, 12(1), 91-92.

Wodarski, J.S. The effects of different reinforcement contingencies on peer-tutoring, studying, disruptive, and achievement behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 32(02-A), 683.

Yee, A.H. Source and direction of causal influence in teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 275-282.

Zirkel, P. and Gable, R.K. The reliability and validity of various measures of self-concept among ethnically different adolescents. Measurements and Evaluation in Guidance, April 1977, 10(1), 48-53.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born in Camaguey, Cuba, on August 2, 1932. At age 16 he dropped out of school. He came to the United States in 1952 where he was graduated from Miami Senior High School in 1953. He later received a Bachelor of Administration degree from the University of Miami in 1955 and returned to Cuba, remaining there until 1960 when he came back to the United States. He began working for the Dade County Public Schools as a substitute teacher in 1960. He worked as a classroom teacher at Miami Senior High School from 1961 until 1970, while working toward certification at Barry College. He received his Master of Science from Barry College in 1973. From 1970 through 1974 the author worked as a visiting teacher for the Dade County Public Schools, and from 1974 to the time of this dissertation he has been an assistant principal. He is presently working in an inner-city junior high school. Prior to completion of this dissertation, in 1976, the author received his Specialist of Education degree from the University of Florida.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

S. Kern Alexander, Chairman
Professor of Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Vance A. Hines, Cochairman
Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ralph B. Kimbrough
Professor of Educational Administration

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1978

Dean, Graduate School